

THE CLERGY REVIEW

Chairman of the Editorial Board:
Most Reverend Archbishop Downey

Editor:
Very Reverend Canon G. D. Smith, D.D., Ph.D.

The Editor is always ready to consider articles which may be of interest to the Clergy, but such articles should be typewritten, with double spacing. We also invite our readers to propose for solution cases in Moral Theology, Canon Law, Liturgy, or other departments of sacred science, and we hope that they will not hesitate to contribute to our Correspondence pages their views on the solution of such cases or on any other matter which falls within the scope of THE CLERGY REVIEW.

Matter offered for publication may be sent direct, to save time to the Editor at St. Edmund's College, Old Hall, Ware, Herts.

Other correspondence should be sent to the Manager

THE CLERGY REVIEW
BURNS OATES & WASHBOURNE LTD.
129 VICTORIA STREET, LONDON, S.W.1

Subscription Rates for twelve monthly numbers:

£1 1 0 OR FIVE DOLLARS POST FREE
SINGLE NUMBERS TWO SHILLINGS AND SIXPENCE

TABLE OF CONTENTS

APRIL 1941

ARTICLES

PAGE

- (1) "Except it be for fornication". A Note on
Matthew xix, 3-12 283
By the Revs. Robert Dyson and Bernard
Leeming, S.J., of the Ven. English
College, at St. Mary's Hall, Stonyhurst
- (2) The Appearances of the Risen Jesus 295
By Rev. Ernest C. Messenger, Ph.D.
- (3) Religious Certainty 307
By Rev. Alphonsus Bonnar, O.F.M., D.D.

HOMILETICS

- The Sundays of May 326
By Rev. Lawrence Hull, C.S.S.R.

DOCTRINE FOR CHILDREN

- Lessons for May 343
By Rev. A. Gits, S.J.

NOTES ON RECENT WORK

- Ascetical and Mystical Theology 350
By Rev. J. Cartmell, D.D., Ph.D., M.A.

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

- (1) National Flag in the Sanctuary 355
- (2) Divorce and Marriage Consent 356
- (3) Tabernacle Key 358
- (4) Reprisals 359
- (5) O Salutaris 360
- (6) Origins of Benediction 361
By Very Rev. Canon E. J. Mahoney, D.D.

CHURCH MANAGEMENT 365

BOOK REVIEWS 367

CORRESPONDENCE 373

The CLERGY REVIEW

NEW SERIES.

VOL. XX, No 4

APRIL, 1941

"EXCEPT IT BE FOR FORNICATION"

A NOTE ON MATTHEW XIX, 3-12

"AND I say to you that whosoever shall put away his wife, except it be for fornication, and shall marry another, committeth adultery; and he that shall marry her that is put away, committeth adultery."

These words cause a formidable difficulty against the Catholic teaching on the indissolubility of marriage. "It is certainly strange," says Father Joyce in his weighty book on Christian Marriage, "that our Lord should have expressed Himself in a manner liable to misinterpretation. It must be owned that no solution which we can offer can lay claim to certainty. But there is nothing improbable in the supposition that the Evangelist has given us a compressed account of what was actually said: and that in fact our Lord set forth in separate statements the indissolubility of marriage, and the right of permanent separation in case of unfaithfulness. The fusion of the two replies into a single sentence would amply account for the obscurity."¹

Now it is not difficult to show that permission for divorce on grounds of adultery is inconsistent with the context of this passage in Matthew and with the whole of the New Testament teaching; many Catholic writers deal effectively with the point, none better than Father Joyce. Indeed, so clearly did our Lord teach the indissolubility of marriage, that many well-known non-Catholic writers conclude that the clause, "except it be for fornication", must be an interpolation, not found in the original text.²

¹ *Christian Marriage, An Historical and Doctrinal Study* (Sheed & Ward, London and New York, 1933), p. 284.

² A somewhat similar solution is that the text should read "Whosoever putteth away his wife save for fornication, and maketh her to commit adultery", in which reading the difficulty about divorce for adultery

But the interpretation of the actual phrase itself has always been found awkward. "If these words occurred out of their context," says Father Joyce, "they would more easily be understood as containing a permission to marry again, when a wife had been put away on the score of adultery."¹ In their context, however, he judges they must mean: "It is not lawful for any man to put away his wife except for impurity: and if a man putteth away his wife [for that or any other cause] and marrieth another woman, he committeth adultery." Hence he concludes, with a large number of Catholic exegetes, that the exceptive clause allows of separation *a mensa et thoro*, but not of divorce *a vinculo*.

This interpretation has grave authorities and persuasive reasons to support it. Nevertheless, it has left many sincere and erudite minds with a certain unhappy sense of perplexity. Separation *a mensa et thoro*, the bond remaining, scarcely appears to have been well known among the Jews at the time of Christ; and if Christ proposed it as permissible in the case of adultery, it is strange that Matthew should have condensed his explanation into so brief and obscure a phrase and that Luke and Mark should have omitted it. Moreover, the word used throughout, "to put away" (*ἀπολύνειν*), seems to have been understood by the Jews as a complete divorce, and no evidence is forthcoming that it was used at that date in the sense of a mere separation from bed and board. It is awkward, to say the least, for the same word to be used in so short a passage as meaning two different things radically opposed in substantial

vanishes. This solution was ably defended by Cardinal MacRory in *The New Testament and Divorce*, re-edited with additional notes by the Very Rev. J. M. T. Barton, in 1934, and reviewed by Father Joyce in the *Month*, 1935, vol. CLXV, p. 178; it is based upon the reading given in Codex B and upon various patristic texts. The argument advanced in this article does not, of course, touch upon this solution, but assumes the more usual text and argues therefrom.

¹Ibid., p. 283.

doctrine.¹ Add to this that the exceptive phrase "except it be for fornication" much more naturally applies both to dismissal of the wife and to remarriage than merely to the dismissal of the wife, and the difficulties inherent in this interpretation become acute.

For this reason, it may perhaps be worth while to consider a suggestion made by Cornely in his Commentary on I Corinthians.² It is that in this text the word *πορνεία* does not mean adultery or general unchastity, but an incestuous union; Cornely thinks that in I Corinthians v, 1, again in Acts xv, as likewise in Matthew v, 32, and xix, 9, the word *πορνεία* bears the same significance, that is, a marriage attempted contrary to the laws of consanguinity enumerated in Leviticus xviii, 6-18, which would amount to incest. Accordingly the words of our Lord in St. Matthew would be understood thus: "And I say unto you that whosoever shall put away his wife, except it be that his marriage with her was incestuous, and shall marry another, committeth adultery." In this interpretation, all difficulty about divorce for adultery manifestly vanishes, the text is in perfect accord with the context, the word "to send away" is understood in the same sense throughout, that is, of a complete and final dismissal, and the exceptive phrase applies to the whole matter in hand. If the word *πορνεία* did not mean adultery, but incest, the interpretation would be delightfully simple; the question is whether this interpretation can be accepted as reasonably probable.

The word *πορνεία*, both in classical Greek and in the Greek of the Septuagint and the New Testa-

¹ "Dimittere (*ἀπολύνειν*), quand il s'agit du mariage, ne signifie pas renvoyer mais répudier, et les Juifs auxquels Jésus parlait ne pouvaient pas l'entendre autrement" (F. Prat, *Jésus Christ, Sa Vie, Sa Doctrine, Son Oeuvre*, 1933, II, p. 86).

² The solution is favoured by Prat, who cites Döllinger, Patrizi, Schlegg, Aberle as well as Cornely; and Mr. W. K. Lowther Clarke defends it with learning and ability. Unfortunately we have not been able to consult these authors, but have pursued independently the suggestion as put forward in Cornely.

ment, is used to mean impurity or unchastity in a very general sense ; in the New Testament Zorell says it signifies any illegitimate sexual act, "including adultery and incest",¹ and Father Joyce holds that "it can certainly bear the sense of adultery".² On the other hand, Schlegg is cited by Knabenbauer as saying that *πορνεία* can never mean adultery. In fact, the only instances in New Testament usage in which Zorell thinks it means adultery are the two places in Matthew (v, 32, and xix, 9), where the meaning is at least doubtful. He himself cites Cornely as against this meaning ; and it is noteworthy that neither the Old Latin nor the Vulgate translated as "adulterium" but as "fornicatio", and the Westminster Version translates as "impurity". Cornely declares that in the New Testament the word is never used to designate the technical sense of adultery ; and he would appear to be right, for Matthew in xv, 19, uses the word *μοιχεία* for adultery and adds *πορνεία* as implying something else.³ In fact, the word *μοιχεία* indicates the specific act of unfaithfulness ; but the word *πορνεία* indicates a base act of unchastity of almost any kind, and its specific meaning must be inferred from the context.⁴

Now it is unquestioned that in one context the word is used to signify an incestuous union. In I Cor. v, 1, Paul says : "It is absolutely heard that there is *πορνεία* among you, and such *πορνεία* as the like is not among the heathen : that one should have his father's wife." Here it is plain that a union against the laws of consanguinity is designated as *πορνεία* ; and the more common and better-founded

¹ *Novi Testamenti Lexicon Graecum. Parisiis, 1911, sub voce.*

² *Op. cit.*, p. 286.

³ To corroborate his statement that *πορνεία* can bear the meaning of adultery, Fr. Joyce refers to Osee, III, 3 ; Amos, VII, 17 ; Eccclus. XXVI, 12. But in these places the meaning appears to be much wider than adultery—to play the harlot in the city, to be of general loose character.

⁴ This is borne out by the following passages in St. Paul : I Cor. vi, 13 ; vii, 2 ; I Thess. iv, 3 ; II Cor. xii, 21 ; Gal. v, 19 ; Eph. v, 3 ; Coloss. iii, 5.

opinion among exegetes holds that there was an attempted marriage.¹ The word *πορνεία*, then, can be used to designate an incestuous union.

There is another place, however, which is more crucial and this is Acts, chapter xv. For an understanding of the meaning of the word, careful consideration of the context is essential; *πορνεία* occurs first in the speech of St. James at the Council of Jerusalem:

I judge that they who from among the Gentiles are converted to God are not to be disquieted:

But that we write unto them, that they refrain themselves from the pollutions of idols and from fornication (*πορνεία*) and from things strangled and from blood.

For Moses of old hath in every city them that preach him in the Synagogues, where he is read every Sabbath. (Acts xv, 19-21.)

Subsequently the Council wrote to the Gentile converts:

We have sent therefore Judas and Silas, who themselves also will by word of mouth, tell you the same things.

For it hath seemed good to the Holy Ghost and to us to lay no further burden upon you than these necessary things:

That you abstain from things sacrificed to idols and from blood and from things strangled and from fornication (*πορνεία*): from which things keeping yourselves, you shall do well. (Acts xv, 27 ff.)

Now, to understand this decision its background must be considered. Some of the Jewish converts maintained that Christianity was only a new form of Judaism, in which the Mosaic law still held good; they were converts from Pharisaism who insisted that the Gentile converts must be circumcised and commanded to observe the law of Moses (xv, 5).

¹ Cf. Cornely *in loc.* and Prat, *Le Théologie de St. Paul in loc.* The expression "to have his father's wife", from parallel passages, strongly suggests an attempted marriage.

Hence the Council of Jerusalem was both urgent and important ; after much disputing (verse 7) over the question, Peter, referring to the Mosaic law as an unbearable yoke, declared in the widest terms its abolition and proclaimed salvation by faith in Christ (verses 10, 11). Then James, Bishop of Jerusalem, accepting Peter's declaration of doctrine, but wishing to avoid shocking the susceptibilities of the Jewish converts brought up in the observance of the Mosaic law, asks that Gentile converts refrain from things offered to idols, that is from food from pagan sacrifices, from *πορνεία*, from the meat of animals that had been strangled and from blood. All four prohibitions are placed upon the same level and three of them are admittedly practices forbidden in the Mosaic legislation. Is it, then, unreasonable to infer that the remaining prohibition, *πορνεία*, is also specifically Mosaic ?

As Lightfoot has pointed out, together with many others,¹ these prohibitions would appear to be derived from Leviticus xvii and xviii, which deal respectively with the offerings of victims to idols, with eating of blood (and consequently of suffocated animals which would retain the blood), and with incestuous unions. It is noteworthy that the decree of the Council of Jerusalem follows Leviticus in its order of enumeration ; and Lightfoot,² Bauer, Ritschl, Zeller, Cornely,³ and others,⁴ notably the eminent H. L. Strack-P. Billerbeck,⁵ understand the prohibition of *πορνεία* as a prohibition of marriages in near degrees of consanguinity or affinity, which would be incestuous.

¹ Cited by Knabenbauer *in loc.*

² *Works*, vol. VIII : Hebrew and Talmudical Exercitations upon Acts of Apostles, pp. 479-81.

³ *iam. cit.*

⁴ Cf. H. A. W. Meyer, *Commentary on New Testament*, tr. Dickson and Crombie (Edinburgh, 1881, p. 60).

⁵ *Kommentar zum Neuen Testament aus Talmud und Midrasch*, II, p. 729 (1924).

The actual words of Strack-Billerbeck are as follows: "Acts xv, 20, πορνεία—here not the ordinary 'fornication' or 'unchastity', since πορνεία in that sense was already forbidden to everyone, so that there was no need of making it the object of a special prohibition for the converted gentiles—but consanguineous marriages, i.e. marriages within the degrees of relationship enumerated in Leviticus xviii, 6-18."¹ This reason seems convincing. The only question raised was how far the Gentiles were to be obliged—if at all—by the Mosaic law; that the Apostles should have written to them imposing observance of the Mosaic law in respect of victims and of the eating of blood—things in themselves indifferent—and in the very same breath should have forbidden fornication, a precept by no means peculiar to the Mosaic law, seems incoherent. Moreover James appears to have referred to the number of Jews who read the law and to their wide dispersion as a reason why the Gentiles should observe these commands, that is, to avoid shocking Jewish susceptibilities. Indeed, so strong is the argument that only specifically Jewish practices were in question, that certain writers have suggested the text should read χοιρεία or πορκεία, that is, the eating of pork, instead of πορνεία.

It is true that several commentators, among them Knabenbauer, Lattey,² A. W. F. Blunt,³ Foakes-Jackson,⁴ think that πορνεία means impurity or fornication in its ordinary sense, and they argue that St. Paul frequently had to admonish his converts against fornication, that the moral standards of the pagan world in this respect were exceedingly low, and hence that the Apostles might reasonably have mentioned fornication as being practically most impor-

¹ Op. cit., p. 729.

² *The Acts of the Apostles*, Westminster Version (Longmans, Green, London, 1933), *in loc.*

³ *The Clarendon Bible*, Acts (Oxford, 1926), *in loc.*

⁴ *The Moffat, N. T., Commentary*, Acts (London, 1938), *in loc.*

tant. This interpretation, however, fails to take account of the main point at issue, which was the observance of the Mosaic law and not the general moral condition of the converts at all. Indeed, whatever may have been the moral state of converts later on, there is no evidence that the converts envisaged by the Council of Jerusalem were anything but exemplary, for the reports about them caused great joy and praise that God had done such great things (Acts xv, 3 and 12).

Another argument used to support the view that *πορνεία* in these passages means ordinary fornication is that merely from the forbidding of *πορνεία* the Gentile converts could scarcely be expected to understand that they were to observe the Jewish tables of consanguinity, and so, unless the word means fornication, the decree of the Council would be unbelievably obscure. Hence Knabenbauer says that since he prefers to think the Apostles would draw up a clear regulation, the word must mean fornication. But against this it must be observed that the Council's own letter says that Judas and Silas were being sent to explain the decree; and Knabenbauer himself defends the sending of Silas and Judas along with Paul and Barnabas on the ground that they were Jews of Jerusalem and thus would carry more weight in suppressing the convert Pharisees who were troubling the Gentile converts. So he practically admits that the whole point of the discussion and the whole sense of the decree bore upon observances specifically Jewish, as seems indeed the fact. Finally, it must be kept in mind that the discussions of the Council probably took place in Aramaic; and in the last analysis the text as we have it today was written by Luke, a Greek, who must have been familiar with the use by his master St. Paul of the word *πορνεία* to designate an incestuous union.

Turning to St. Matthew's Gospel it must be observed that the problem is not only exactly what the exceptive phrase, "except for impurity" (or fornication), may mean, but likewise why the exception is used by Matthew and omitted by Mark and Luke. If the phrase authorizes divorce for adultery, or authorizes a perpetual separation for adultery, it is strange that both Mark and Luke omitted it. Matthew, moreover, used the phrase without any explanation, apparently thinking that it would be quite clear to his readers. Now, very many of the ideas embodied in his work suppose a Jewish class of reader; he gives no explanation of Jewish laws or customs, but takes them for granted as known and understood. Much that he wrote would be meaningless to Gentile converts. His Gospel was destined for the Jewish Christians of Palestine, among whom were found that class of pharisaic converts whose objections to the Gentile converts occasioned the legislation of the Council of Jerusalem regarding *πορνεία*, or incestuous unions. Mark and Luke, on the other hand, were not, like Matthew, writing with Jews primarily in mind, but for Gentile Christians. We may, then, suspect *a priori* that the exceptive phrase embodies something which the Jews would readily understand, which the Gentiles might not so readily understand, but which would not in any way change the substantial absoluteness of Christ's rejection of divorce.

Further, our Lord in this famous passage in Matthew xix was engaged in a Jewish type of dispute; the Pharisees wished to catch Him out and their question was a legalistic one, presupposing a knowledge on both sides of the Mosaic legislation, and probably also a knowledge of the different schools of interpretation of that legislation. Both Christ and the Pharisees took for granted a knowledge of Deuteronomy xxiv, 1: "If a man take a wife and have

her, and she find not favour in his eyes for some uncleanness, he shall write her a bill of divorce, and shall give it into her hand, and send her out of his house." This was the law urged by the Pharisees against Christ and repudiated by Him as a concession to the hardness of their hearts. Then our Lord declared in unmistakable terms that a man may not send away his wife and that he commits adultery if he marries another. In His dispute with the Jews, had our Lord said no more than that, the quibbling Pharisees might easily have retorted: "But what about the case of a marriage against the prohibitions of Leviticus? What about John the Baptist who told Herod that he must dismiss Herodias whom he had married?" (It is noteworthy that Mark explicitly says that Herod had "married" Herodias; hence such a union would be regarded as in some sort a marriage.) "You surely are too absolute in your assertion." The case of Herod and Herodias, over which John the Baptist lost his life, must have been well known; and so, to guard Himself against any possible legalistic objection based upon Leviticus xviii regarding incestuous unions, our Lord put in the qualifying phrase. It was designed to forestall any specious cavil based upon the ground that incestuous unions must be broken off by sending away the woman who was thus married.

Clearly Matthew put in the exceptive clause without any thought that he might be misunderstood. He used, of course, an Aramaic word; and it seems not improbable that the translator of Matthew's original Aramaic rendered this Aramaic word for incest with the same Greek word already used in the letter to the Corinthians and in the report of the Council of Jerusalem. No doubt the discussions at the Council of Jerusalem and the case of the incestuous Corinthian would be fairly widely known; so that in the mind of the translator of Matthew the

word *πορνεία* might be associated with a violation of the laws of consanguinity, and his readers would readily have understood Christ to have said: "Whosoever putteth away his wife—there being no question, of course, of the marriage being incestuous—and marrieth another woman, committeth adultery."

Against this possible explanation of the text, it may be urged that such incestuous unions were probably too rare among the Jews to make it worth while for Christ to take account of such an exception in laying down a universal law about marriage. Nevertheless, we know the cases of Herod and of the incestuous Corinthian, and such weighty authorities as Lightfoot and Strack-Billerbeck take it as certain that the Council of Jerusalem thought the matter needed legislation. Our Lord Himself, disputing with legalistically minded Pharisees, may well have covered Himself against objection by inserting the exceptive phrase. And it may well be remarked with Prat that the interpretation of separation from bed and board would be one scarcely intelligible to the Jews, as the use of the word *απολυεῖν* in a double sense would be confusing, if not misleading.

Again, it may perhaps be asked if Christ is to be understood as approving the prohibited degrees laid down in Leviticus? To this it may be answered that He presumes indeed that incest invalidates marriage, but what exactly constitutes incest it was not His purpose to settle on this occasion.

To sum up, the exceptive phrase ("save for fornication") in Matthew causes every exegete the greatest difficulty, and, as Father Joyce well says, no interpretation can claim certainty. The interpretation more usual among Catholics, that the phrase permits separation *a mensa et thoro*, though certainly probable, still has an awkwardness about it which leaves many minds unsatisfied and puzzled. The

interpretation here suggested, that the exception referred only to incestuous unions, has this to say for itself: the Greek translator of Matthew did not use *μοιχεία*, but *πορνεία*, a word whose precise meaning is to be derived from the context; the word *πορνεία* in Corinthians certainly refers to incestuous unions; as the Council of Jerusalem deals with specifically Jewish customs, most probably it used the word *πορνεία* in the same meaning; this meaning gives an understandable reason why Matthew used the exemptive phrase and why Mark and Luke left it out, since it embodied a reference to legislation definitely Jewish. Finally this interpretation gives a coherency to Christ's declaration against divorce, since He says, in effect: "Whosoever putteth away his wife—unless, of course, his marriage to her was incestuous—and marrieth another woman, he committeth adultery."

The interpretation seems at least worth consideration, and as such we offer it to the readers of the CLERGY REVIEW.

ROBERT DYSON, S.J.
BERNARD LEEMING, S.J.

THE APPEARANCES OF THE RISEN JESUS

THE harmonizing of the narratives of the four Gospels is often difficult, but, in the opinion of the present writer, it is nowhere so difficult as in the accounts of the Resurrection of Our Lord. The difficulty is not at all apparent if we confine ourselves to reading the accounts of each manifestation separately, as we find them for instance in the eight Gospels for the Masses for Easter and its Octave. The difficulty occurs when we endeavour to piece together the various narratives into one coherent whole.

True, there are many Harmonies of the Gospels in existence, and we know that there can be no real contradiction between the various narratives, and that, as the late Father Bede Jarrett wrote, "The apparent contradictions in the order of Our Lord's risen appearances is due entirely to the fragmentary character of the Gospel narratives."¹ Even so, in view of the existence of so many Harmonies of the Gospels in general, and of the Resurrection narratives in particular, it is well for us to bear in mind the warning of so excellent an authority as the Rev. Dr. Reilly in his English translation of St. John's Gospel in the Westminster Version: "the uncertainty whether any of the holy women were with Mary Magdalen" when she ran to tell Peter and John of the empty tomb, and in what followed, "makes it impossible to establish with certainty the mutual relations of the Resurrection narratives, and the precise details of the events".² This enunciates a principle which may well have a wider application.

There is another important point. It may be comparatively easy to give a Harmony of the Resurrection narratives. But one requisite of a satisfactory

¹ *The Resurrection*, Catholic Truth Society, p. 5.

² P. 103, footnote.

harmony is that, in the light of it, we must be able to explain why one particular Gospel gives its own particular narrative, and includes its own special incidents, to the exclusion of others.

The problem would be simplified if we could determine with certainty the precise content of that part of the Apostolic Catechesis which dealt with the Resurrection. For, as is well known, it is fairly certain that there was a definite Catechesis concerning the Life of our Lord in existence before the Gospels were written, and this Catechesis formed the basis of the Apostolic preaching, and doubtless also of the Synoptic Gospels. It has been urged by Father Lattey¹ that this Apostolic Catechesis is summarized in Acts x, 37-43 :

"You know the word which hath been published through all Judea, for it began from Galilee after the baptism which John preached, Jesus of Nazareth, how God anointed him with the Holy Ghost and with power . . ."

The Resurrection is referred to here in the following terms :

"Him God raised up the third day, and gave him to be made manifest, not to all the people, but to witnesses pre-ordained by God, even to us, who did eat and drink with him after he arose again from the dead ; and he commanded us to preach to the people, and to testify that it is he who was appointed by God to be judge of the living and of the dead."

Father Lattey remarks that this summary as a whole "reminds us forcibly of the Gospel of St. Mark". And certainly St. Mark's Gospel follows the general plan outlined in the Acts, and develops it in detail. Unfortunately, it is hardly possible to say that the account of the Resurrection in Mark xvi,

¹ *Westminster Version*, Vol. I ; *The Synoptic Gospels*, p. 372.

9-20, can be regarded satisfactorily as an elaboration of St. Peter's summary of the Resurrection Catechesis as given in the Acts. But, as is well known, Mark xvi, 9-20, may not have formed part of the original draft of St. Mark's Gospel.

It seems to the present writer that a more revealing account of the Apostolic Catechesis on the Resurrection may be discovered in St. Paul's statement in I Cor. xv, 1-7. Note that St. Paul calls it part of "the Gospel":

"I make known unto you, brethren, the Gospel which I preached to you, which also you have received. . . . For I delivered unto you first of all, which I also received, how that Christ died for our sins, according to the Scriptures; and that he was buried, and that he rose again the third day, according to the Scriptures, and that he was seen by Cephas, and after that by the eleven. Then was he seen by more than five hundred brethren at once (of whom many remain until this present, and some are fallen asleep). After that, he was seen by James, then by all the Apostles."

Presumably those mentioned here are the "witnesses pre-ordained by God" mentioned in Acts x, 42.

If the above passage could be taken as the outline of the Apostolic Catechesis on the Resurrection, we should at least have the basis on which the Evangelists may be supposed to have worked. For, as St. Luke in particular tells us, he wrote his own Gospel "that thou mayest know the verity of those words in which thou hast been instructed". The Evangelists, then, will presumably take the Apostolic Catechesis as their basis, elaborate certain points in it (to the exclusion, perhaps, of others), and even add to it if they think it desirable. We need not be alarmed about the word "exclusion". We must always remember that exclusion is not equivalent to negation. The classical proof of this is that the same St. Luke who, in his Gospel, speaks as though Jesus

ascended into heaven immediately after the appearance to the Apostles in Jerusalem (Luke xxiv, 50), explains in the Acts that forty days intervened between the two events (Acts i, 3).

There is another point we must bear in mind : the evangelists may reasonably be presumed to have been acquainted with the work of their predecessors. Thus, we may reasonably suppose that St. Mark knew of St. Matthew's Gospel ;¹ that St. Luke knew of both St. Matthew and St. Mark (cf. Luke i, 1), and that St. John, who wrote so many years later, knew of the three Synoptic Gospels. This may help us to understand certain omissions and additions by those who wrote after St. Matthew. Mere repetition might reasonably be avoided, while the addition of supplementary matter would be quite understandable.

Having said all this by way of introduction, we can at once mention a difficulty which is easily the most serious of all those that have been advanced against the Resurrection narratives in general. It consists in the fact that, as we learn from St. Matthew and St. Mark, Jesus had told his Apostles after the Last Supper that, after the Resurrection, he would "go before them into Galilee" (Matthew xxvii, 32 ; Mark xiv, 28), and accordingly, when the holy women visited the tomb and found it empty, the angel instructed them to tell the disciples that Christ had risen, "and behold he will go before you into Galilee ; there you shall see him" (Matthew xxviii, 7 ; Mark xvi, 7). And in point of fact, Matthew is silent about any appearances of Jesus to the Apostles in Jerusalem, and speaks only of the final appearance in Galilee. Rationalists have gone so far as to infer from these facts that an appearance or appearances of Jesus in Galilee, real or imagined, constituted the original story, and that the Jerusalem

¹ See especially the evidence for this adduced by Abbot Chapman in his great work, *Matthew, Mark and Luke*.

appearances were only added as an afterthought, to support the story of the Galilee apparitions. Such an inference is rightly dismissed at once as absurd. Yet the problem remains : if Jesus promised to appear in Galilee, and urged his Apostles to go there to see Him, why did He forthwith appear in Jerusalem ?

It seems to the present writer that an answer might be framed as follows : Jesus did not at first intend to appear to the Apostles in Jerusalem at all. He considered it sufficient to send them a message through the angel, and the holy women. For, as he subsequently told Thomas, those who believe although they see not are as much, if not more blessed than those who believe because they see (John xx, 29). The Apostles, however, did not believe in the angel's message transmitted to them by the holy women, or even in other indirect appearances of Our Lord Himself. And so, because of their incredulity, He modified his original plan to the extent of appearing to all the Apostles in Jerusalem, on two occasions. Then they betook themselves to Galilee, in accordance with the original instructions of the angel. There Jesus appeared to them on many occasions, instructing them concerning the Kingdom of God (Acts i, 3).

It is significant that in the two Galilaean appearances narrated in detail in the Gospels, there took place both the appointment of Peter as Supreme Shepherd of the flock (John xxi, 15-17) and the solemn and final commission to "teach all nations". These two facts are surely sufficient in themselves to explain the supreme importance attached in the first two Gospels to the appearances in Galilee.

Let us now see in detail how we can establish a tentative Harmony of the Resurrection narratives in the light of the above principles.

First we have the visit of the holy women, including St. Mary Magdalen, to the sepulchre. This is

mentioned by all four evangelists. We gather from St. Luke that there were at least five women who went, but we need not suppose that they all went at the same time. Mary Magdalen seems to have gone straight to the tomb (John xx, i), while the others went first to buy spices (Mark xvi, 1). Mary Magdalen, seeing the stone rolled away and the tomb empty, ran straight off to tell Peter and John that Jesus's body had been taken to some unknown place (John xx, 2). Peter and John immediately went to the sepulchre, presumably in the Magdalen's company. They found it empty. John was convinced that Jesus must have risen, but Peter "went away wondering in himself at that which was come to pass" (Luke xxiv, 12).

Meanwhile the other women had arrived at the sepulchre with their spices (Matthew xxviii, 1; Mark xvi, 2; Luke xxiv, 1). They found the tomb empty, and entered. An angel instructed them to announce the Resurrection to the Apostles, and to say that they were to proceed to Galilee to see Jesus there (Matt. xxviii, 2-7; Mark xvi, 5-7; Luke xxiv, 5-8; there are minor variations: Matthew says the angel was sitting on the stone, Mark that he was sitting on the right side within the sepulchre, while Luke mentions two angels within the sepulchre. These are easily harmonized.) The holy women went away and gave the message to the Apostles (Peter and John were probably absent with Magdalen). St. Mark does indeed say that the holy women "told nothing to any man", but this may mean that they told no one on the way. That they did in fact tell the Apostles is clear from Matthew xxviii, 8 (which Mark had presumably seen) and Luke xxiv, 10 (and Luke presumably knew of Mark's statement).

But though the holy women gave their message to the Apostles, "these words seemed to them as idle

tales, and they did not believe them" (Luke xxiv, 11). Even the return of the puzzled Peter and the believing John from the empty sepulchre did not do much to change their attitude. As the two disciples said on their way to Emmaus the same day, "some of our people went to the sepulchre, and found it so as the women had said, but Jesus they found not" (Luke xxiv, 24).

So far there had been no personal appearance of the Master Himself. But in face of the continued scepticism of the Apostles (with the exception of John), Jesus decided to appear Himself and send a message to the Apostles. He chose the same messengers as before—Mary Magdalen and the other holy women. He appeared first to Mary Magdalen, who had remained at the sepulchre after the departure of Peter and John. Jesus told Mary to go and tell the Apostles that He had indeed risen, and would shortly ascend to his Father (John xxi, 11-17). About the same time, Jesus appeared also to the other holy women, who had presumably returned to the neighbourhood of the tomb after visiting the apostles, and told them to repeat the command already given through the angel: "Go, tell my brethren that they go into Galilee; there they shall see me" (Matt. xxviii, 9, 10). These messages were duly given to the Apostles (John xxi, 18; Mark xvi, 9), but they failed to convince the sceptics. "Mary Magdalen went and told them that had been with Jesus, and they, hearing that he was alive and had been seen by her, did not believe" (Mark xvi, 10, 11).¹

As these messages and indirect appearances had still failed to convince the Apostles, Jesus went a step further, and appeared to Peter, who was evidently still wondering about the empty tomb (Luke

¹ Some think that there was no separate appearance to the holy women other than that to Mary Magdalen. (E.g. Lagrange.) In this case we should have to suppose that Mary Magdalen was commissioned to announce the appearance in Galilee as well as the Ascension.

xxiv, 12). This is the appearance to Cephas which occupies the first place in the list in I Corinthians xv, 5-7. It was obviously regarded as of great importance. Even so, it is passed over in silence by Matthew, and is not mentioned in Mark's final summary. But Matthew omits all the Jerusalem appearances, except that to Mary Magdalen mentioned above, and passes on at once to the great appearance in Galilee, with its final commission to the Apostles. All the other appearances were subordinate to and in a sense preparatory to this one. As to the silence of Mark, he after all gives no details of any of the appearances. Luke, on the other hand, mentions the appearance to Peter in passing. Perhaps he was not acquainted with the details.

Luke likewise mentions an appearance of Jesus to two disciples on their way to Emmaus on Easter Day. This is mentioned also by St. Mark : "After that, he appeared in another shape to two of them walking, as they were going into the country" (Mark xvi, 12). They at once returned to Jerusalem, where "they found the eleven gathered together and those that were with them, saying 'The Lord is risen indeed, and hath appeared to Simon'" (Luke xxiv, 12-34 ; Mark xvi, 12). St. Luke's account would lead us to think that the Apostles were now all convinced. But St. Mark says otherwise : "They (the two disciples) going told it to the rest ; neither did they believe them" (xvi, 13). Peter and John were already convinced, as we have seen, but probably most of the others were still sceptical. Even Peter had so far failed in his endeavour to "confirm his brethren".

And so Jesus, having failed to convince the Apostles by any other means, decided to appear to them all while they were gathered together in the Upper Room at Jerusalem on Easter Sunday evening.

This important appearance is passed over by St. Matthew, for the reason already explained. It is, however, mentioned in Mark (xvi, 14-18) Luke (xxiv, 36-49) and John (xx, 19-29). These three accounts supplement each other. According to Mark, on this occasion Jesus "upbraided them with their incredulity and hardness of heart, because they did not believe them who had seen him after he was risen again" (v. 14)—an important statement, which constitutes one of our reasons for supposing that this appearance to the Apostles in Jerusalem was not part of our Lord's original plan.

St. Mark also mentions that on this occasion Jesus gave to the Apostles a universal commission to preach and baptize (vv. 15, 16), while Matthew attributes the same or a similar commission to the later meeting in Galilee. Some think that Mark is anticipating here. But it seems to the present writer much more reasonable to suppose that Jesus did in fact commission the Apostles on this occasion to preach and baptize. Luke, in his account of this meeting, similarly asserts that Jesus instructed his Apostles "that penance and the remission of sins should be preached in his name unto all nations", and though Luke certainly fails, as we have said, to give in his Gospel any details of other appearances of Jesus, whether in Jerusalem or Galilee, there is no need to suppose that he and Mark are attributing to the Easter Sunday meeting something which really took place later on in Galilee. One thing is certain from John's account, and that is, that on this occasion Jesus uttered the momentous words: "Receive ye the Holy Ghost. Whose sins you shall forgive, they are forgiven them, and whose sins you shall retain, they are retained" (John xx, 22, 23). According to the Council of Trent, it was chiefly by these words that the Sacrament of Penance was instituted. But it is difficult to suppose that on this first appear-

ance Jesus would have spoken of the Sacrament of Penance without mentioning the Sacrament of Baptism. If we accept the narratives in Mark and Luke as they stand, the story is quite clear. Jesus says that "penance and the remission of sins" are to be preached "unto all nations"; the Apostles are to go "into the whole world", to preach and baptize, and quite naturally Jesus goes on to give this further power to forgive sins committed after baptism, as mentioned in St. John. It would be difficult, surely, to explain the omission, on the other hypothesis, of any reference to the Sacrament of Baptism on this occasion, inasmuch as the Sacrament of Penance presupposes Baptism, and cannot be understood apart from it.

It is worthy of note that on this occasion Jesus ate with his disciples, and so this may well be one of the manifestations referred to in St. Luke's other work, the Acts of the Apostles :

"He appeared . . . even to us, who did eat and drink with him after he arose again from the dead" (Acts x, 41).

The other appearances do not present any special difficulties. There was a second appearance to the Apostles in Jerusalem eight days after Easter, to remove the doubts of Thomas who was absent on the previous occasion (John xx, 26-29). It was on this occasion that Jesus uttered the momentous words : "Because thou hast seen me, Thomas, thou hast believed ; blessed are they that have not seen and have believed." This confirms us in the view that Jesus would have preferred not to appear to his Apostles in Jerusalem before the manifestation in Galilee, and that He appeared in the Holy City only because of their unbelief.

It would seem that almost immediately after this second appearance, the Apostles betook themselves to Galilee. There Jesus appeared to them from time

to time, and instructed them concerning the Kingdom of God (Acts i, 3). St. John mentions in detail one important appearance by the side of the Lake of Galilee, when Peter was appointed the supreme shepherd of Christ's flock (John xxi, 12-4). It was also on one of the hills around the Lake, in all probability, that Jesus gave to the Apostles the great commission recorded in Matthew xxviii, 18-20: "All power is given to me in heaven and in earth. Going therefore, teach ye all nations, baptizing them . . . teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you. And behold I am with you all days, even to the consummation of the world." This may be identical with the appearance to "five hundred brethren at once" mentioned in I Cor. xv, 6: in that case we can the more easily understand St. Matthew's statement that, even on this occasion, "some doubted" (Matt. xxviii, 17). For it is unthinkable that there was any further doubt in the minds of the Apostles themselves, though there may have been in some of the disciples. Moreover, this presence of the five hundred disciples would provide a reason for the public repetition of the commission already privately given (as we suppose) to the Apostles on Easter Sunday in Jerusalem.

At some time and place unspecified, there was also an appearance to James (I Cor. xv, 7). The Gospels do not mention this, but neither do they exclude it.

After the appearances in Galilee, there was, at the end of the forty days, one last appearance in Jerusalem, when Jesus told the Apostles to stay in the Holy City till Pentecost (Luke xxiv, 49; cf. Acts i, 4-8; I Cor. xv, 7), and then led them out to the Mount of Olives, where He ascended into heaven (Acts i, 9-11; Luke xxiv, 50-52; Mark xvi, 19).

If the above account is in the main correct, we have a coherent reason for the importance attached to the Galilee manifestations by St. Matthew (and perhaps by Mark) to the exclusion of the manifestations in Jerusalem. Moreover, the suggested harmony has the additional advantage of enabling us to understand why particular evangelists concentrated on certain features of the Resurrection narrative rather than on others. And again we see how the list of Resurrection appearances given in I Cor. xv, 5-6, and which, in our view, formed part of the Apostolic Catechesis, underlies the Gospel accounts, and why the evangelists select some of these appearances for further explanation, and also supplement them by some others, such as those to the holy women and to the disciples on the way to Emmaus. They constitute additional proofs of the fundamental fact of the Christian Religion.

Lastly, the continued incredulity manifested by the apostles shows clearly that if they ultimately came to believe in the reality of the Resurrection, it was only because of the irrefutable evidence given them, and because as St. Luke says, "Jesus shewed himself alive after his Passion, by many proofs" or incontestable manifestations (Luke i, 3).

E. C. MESSENGER.

RELIGIOUS CERTAINTY

IN October, 1935, I made the statement that the following five years would be crucial for the prospect of the conversion of our country, or of any considerable part of it. I gave it as my opinion that the desire for truth, which had been aroused in many as a result of the cataclysm of 1914-1918 and the succeeding ten or twelve years, would gradually give place to the agnostic indifference which had preceded 1914. My view was based upon fairly continuous observation of non-Catholic thought from the vantage point of the C.E.G. and Motor Mission platforms and from contact with individual non-Catholics. But the prophecy was conditional upon our national affairs pursuing a course of more or less even tenor. However, since 1935 two events have shaken the country to its foundations. The first was the abdication of Edward VIII, which was followed by an outburst of orthodoxy in the Established Church. This was an event which did not, I fancy, benefit the Catholic position. The second happening has been, of course, the present war. This, in my opinion, has provided another possibility of conversion on a large scale. Its unsettling effects in the intellectual and religious sphere are likely to go deeper and to last longer than in the case of the last war. In other words we have been given another chance. The opportunity afforded by the last war and its consequent mental upheaval was not adequately used, though some use was made of it particularly through the medium of the Catholic Evidence Guild. But I hope that this time something on a much larger scale will be planned and carried into effect.

For these reasons I think that the topic of Religious Certainty is a vital and pressing question. We cannot battle for truth without a sound apologetic,

and the matter of religious certainty is the very foundation of our apologetic position. It is therefore regrettable that there should be such a lack of clear and precise thought in this matter. It is even more lamentable that incorrect ideas should be as prevalent as they are. Particularly is it to be deplored that some should be so infected with non-Catholic ideas as to think of entrance into the Church as a "leap in the dark" to be afterwards justified by religious experience in the Church. To help to dissipate the current vagueness by explaining the solid rational basis of our Catholic position, I have put together my own thoughts on this question of religious certainty. The question is mainly one of the certainty of the conclusions of Apologetics, i.e. of the fact of revelation. But, in the interests of completeness of treatment and for greater clarity, I have added a second—shorter—section on the certainty of faith.

I

Not a little vagueness centres round the question of the certainty of the conclusions at which we arrive in the demonstration of the truth of Christianity. This certainty of the conclusions of Apologetics is usually said to be "moral" certainty. In this there lurks—especially in English—an ambiguity and therefore a danger. If this term, moral certainty, is retained, it is necessary that its meaning be made quite clear. Further obscurity arises from the confusion which there is in the minds of many between the certainty of the tenets of divine faith and the certainty of the conclusions arrived at in Apologetics. These are two distinct sets of truths, and although all doubt is excluded in both cases, yet the kind of certainty in each case is different and rests on a different foundation.

That things really exist outside our minds and that the human mind can obtain an understanding of these things, I take as admitted. The mind of man can attain an understanding or knowledge of these external things and facts *which excludes all possibility of error*, i.e. all possibility of such knowledge not being in conformity with objective reality. This state of the mind which excludes all rational doubt is called certainty. Our intelligence can of course be deceived and its certainty or exclusion of doubt be merely subjective, but such certainty is not formal certainty: this latter requires that there shall be conclusive objective intellectual argument which excludes doubt. It is this formal certainty which we claim for the conclusions of Christian and Catholic Apologetics.

I have already pointed out that the certainty of these conclusions is said to be moral certainty. It is very important to understand what this means and particularly to realize that this moral certainty is not merely extreme probability.

The word "moral" comes from the Latin *mos* (*morem*), meaning "a habit". Without looking any further than this we might reasonably say that "moral" certainty would therefore be either (1) the convictions upon which we base our *mores* or customary manner of acting, or (2) certainty which arises from our knowledge of man's *mores* or usual way of acting. As a matter of fact the term "moral certainty" is used in both senses.¹ If, however, certainty is the exclusion of *all* rational doubt, it is evident that moral certainty in the former of the two senses is not

¹ This is not to be confused with the certainty which moralists say we must have as to the lawfulness of our actions. The certainty which they require is real certainty, but it does not regard the *speculative* lawfulness of an act which may remain doubtful. It regards its practical lawfulness and, as certainty, is only attained indirectly by the use of the reflex principle that man is in possession of his freedom until it is demonstrated *with certainty* that that freedom is taken away by a supervening precept.

really certainty.¹ It is called certainty because there is sufficient exclusion of doubt for the present practical purpose. "Prudent conviction" might be a more accurate description of this state of mind: for "conviction" does not imply formal objective certainty and "prudent" indicates the necessity of a greater degree of probability according to the importance of the matter in hand.

When we consider moral certainty in the second of the two senses mentioned we have to go deeper. The truths to which the human mind can attain, whether they be self-evident first principles or be arrived at by a process of reasoning, can be grouped into three classes. *Firstly*, some are truths which must be as they are and could not possibly be otherwise: e.g. that God alone exists of Himself; that two and two make four; that the square on the hypotenuse of a right-angled triangle is equal to the sum of the squares on the other two sides. They express necessary relations and are called metaphysical or necessary truths. *Secondly*, some are truths which

¹ Some writers (e.g. A. Tanqueray, *Synopsis Theologiae Dogmaticae Fundamentalibus*, Paris, 15th edit., 1914, p. 16) use the term to mean the certainty of an assent which can only be given by persons properly disposed—i.e. having certain good moral qualities of intellect and will—and which entails certain consequences for the practical moral (ethical) life of such persons. As to the latter of these two conditions, it comes *after* the assent, and therefore cannot be an essential factor in the certainty except in so far as it influences the will in commanding the assent. The necessity of good moral (ethical) qualities of intellect and will to procure assent in many cases is, of course, evident, but it does not seem reasonable to designate the kind of certainty from this fact. Assent in all its phases of doubt, opinion and certainty is an act of the intellect, and it seems best to name it according to the kind of argument which produces it, as will be explained presently. The part played by the will in producing certainty of assent is discussed at some length later in this essay. The view of Tanqueray, to which I have alluded, obscures the fact that moral certainty is real certainty. This is more especially so since he says that this certainty excludes all *prudent* doubt. (*Synopsis Theologiae Dogmaticae Specialis*, Paris, 14th edit., 1913, vol. I, p. 97.) The expression "prudent doubt" is unfortunate because prudence, being *recta ratio agendorum*, has no fixed standard of its own and takes its standard from a consideration of the matter in hand. Prudence demands, e.g., that I shall not doubt the considered judgement of an optical specialist: yet no one will say that such a judgement has the finality of the conclusions of Apologetics. Real certainty of whatever kind must exclude all *rational* doubt, i.e. doubt which has a foundation in weakness of the evidence.

refer to the properties of the various things in the universe: e.g. that fire burns; that light travels quicker than sound; these are called physical truths. *Thirdly*, there are truths which are based upon the customary way in which men act (their *mores*), e.g. that a town is busier during the day than during the night; these are called moral truths.¹

All conclusions at which our mind arrives, unless they are self-evident first principles or facts *immediately* perceived by the senses, rest upon a chain of reasoning in which truths belonging to one or other of the three classes enumerated are the links. The objective exclusion of error in such conclusions depends upon the exclusion of error in the propositions which form the sequence of reasoning and one false proposition in the series will render the conclusion false, i.e. logically false or unproven. If certainty, i.e. the exclusion of all rational doubt, is reached, it is named metaphysical, physical, or moral, according as the truths upon which it is based are of one or other of the three classes mentioned. And here we have moral certainty in its most accurate sense and in the sense in which it is used in Apologetics. Let us examine it a little further.

I have already said that moral truths in this connection are truths which enunciate or are based

¹ I have not made any distinction between the attainment of the knowledge of an *isolated fact* (e.g. that I added two apples to two apples and the result was four; that I burnt a piece of paper by applying a match to it; that the King smiled) and the attainment of a *generalization* in knowledge (e.g. that the whole is always greater than the part, that mercury is heavier than water, that most men take their rest at night). The distinction is not necessary for my purpose, but it is worth while to note in passing that our knowledge of isolated *facts* having happened depends entirely on the reliability of the senses of the person perceiving them, and that when we have knowledge of such facts from the testimony of those who perceived them, such knowledge is always in the same category as historical knowledge. Certainty is, then, historical in spite of the general physical or metaphysical law under which the fact itself is ranged. Thus, although it is a physical law that fire burns, the destruction wrought by the Great Fire of London is historical certainty not physical. Although by metaphysical law two and two make four, yet such law does not say that at any time any two things were added to any other two things.

upon the usual way in which men act. The reason for putting such truths in a class by themselves is that the determining factor in every human act is man's free will. Yet, regarding these human activities, although in each act each individual is free, we can frame certain generalizations, the truth of which admits of no doubt whatever. It is evident that such generalizations are based upon considerations of human nature and human experience which are very different from the chemical, mechanical, and other factors which determine physical truth. Hence truths of this kind stand in a class by themselves.

Some types of certainty in moral truth of this kind will make the matter clearer. Historical knowledge, for example, is based upon generalizations of human activity which declare the reliability of human testimony. Another type of truth of this kind is found in the generalizations which we can form from our own daily experience concerning some of the activities of the men in whose midst we move : as when we know that a particular thoroughfare is crowded at a particular time. These by way of example.

Having considered the meaning of "moral certainty", we are in a position to determine whether the certainty of the conclusions of Apologetics is moral certainty in this acceptation. Let us consider one by one the arguments by which we arrive at the conclusions of Apologetics.

(1) The introductory arguments concerning the necessity of religion. The arguments of this group are metaphysical and therefore lead to metaphysical certainty.

(2) The arguments proving the necessity of a *revealed* religion for man. These arguments are based on the moral order as I have explained it (e.g. that a man on account of various impediments, not physical impossibility, cannot by himself attain even the fundamentals of natural religion) and therefore the

conclusions which follow are morally certain in the same sense.

(3) The whole scheme of the arguments for Christianity proper depends upon the trustworthiness of the New Testament writings as historical records. This is proved, as is the case with all history, by arguments of the moral order. The certainty is therefore moral certainty from this point of view.

(4) The veracity of Our Blessed Lord in His statements regarding His divine mission is proved by a "moral" argument: namely, that falsehood or hallucination on this central claim of His teaching would be quite impossible considering His admittedly incomparable wisdom and eminent sanctity.

(5) The miracles (including the prophecies) are metaphysical arguments (leading to metaphysical certainty), once their historical reality and divine origin are proved. The proof of these latter, however, involves physical and "moral" arguments.

(6) The fact of the institution and the nature of the Church are the positive will of God through Christ. That the assertions in this regard were actually made by Christ is a historical fact and as such is "morally" certain.

(7) The argument which usually precedes the foregoing concerning the necessity of an infallible authority is of course based on considerations of human nature, i.e. on "moral" considerations.

Most, therefore, of the arguments, upon which the conclusions of Apologetics are based, are arguments of the moral order as I have explained it. Even many of the metaphysical arguments involved are contained within an historical argument and therefore become part of such argument. Hence the certainty of the conclusions is rightly called "moral" certainty.

I have already noted, in passing, that this certainty is certainty in the true sense of the word, namely, that state of mind produced by conclusive

reasons and excluding all rational doubt. This question of the exclusion of doubt I now wish to discuss.

There is a vague, unreasoning feeling on the part of some that moral certainty in Apologetics does not exclude all rational doubt, that is to say that the arguments have not in themselves that conclusive force. This is partly due to the confusion and want of clearness in the use of terms which I have already tried to dissipate. But let us examine the question in itself and see whether moral certainty, as we have explained it, excludes all rational doubt. This really means asking ourselves whether it is really certainty. The difficulty principally concerns the historical process involved and we may confine our attention to that.

Let us consider historical truth in general and take as an example some well-known fact of history, e.g. the Napoleonic Wars. The reasoning by which we obtain knowledge of this fact is based on the "moral" order. Now, is it at all possible that the Napoleonic Wars never took place? Decidedly not, you will say. Why does your mind refuse to admit any possibility of the falsity of its knowledge of this fact? Because we have the written evidence of trustworthy contemporaries of the event and their unwritten evidence, possibly committed to writing a generation later, handed down to us by tradition. Evidently therefore historical knowledge admits of no possibility of falsity if it is based on the evidence of trustworthy contemporaries. Now it is capital to note that this evidence does not diminish in value as proof of the fact with the passage of time, provided its trustworthiness can still be demonstrated. A thousand years from now the Napoleonic Wars will be certain fact in people's minds if the men of that time can be assured that they have the testimony of trustworthy contemporaries to the fact, just as today

the fact of the accession of William of Normandy to the throne of England is certain truth for us. Historical evidence therefore can exclude all possibility of falsity under conditions which it is not our purpose to consider here. That in the historical and other evidence adduced in Apologetics the conditions required are fulfilled I wish merely to point out—not prove.¹

What I have written may appear to some to be a contention that the truth of Christianity is much like the conclusion of a mathematical problem. They will say that the things of the soul are more elusive and are not to be caught and labelled like that. In this connection we must consider another all-important factor, namely, the part played by man's will. It would indeed appear at first sight that, if the proofs are so convincing, a man cannot refuse his assent to the conclusions arrived at and that his assent when given will not be a free act, but one which the character of the proof compels him to elicit.

Let us first consider the matter in general without reference to religious Apologetics. There are cases in which sane human reason *must* assent whether the individual wishes or not. This is so when primary metaphysical truths or evident physical truths (or conclusions *immediately* derived from either) are placed before man's intellect. The mind in such cases can no more refuse assent than blotting-paper can refuse to absorb a drop of water that falls on it. Its assent in such cases is therefore not a free act, directly at least. Indirectly a man is able to refuse his assent in such cases by refusing to consider the matter at

¹ In the actual study of Apologetics we see very clearly that those who attack the historical authority of the Gospels do so because they hold false philosophical principles, e.g. that miracles are impossible. They accept as undoubtedly trustworthy records, many documents, e.g. our text of Caesar's Commentaries, the manuscript authority of which is far inferior to that of the Gospels.

all, as a piece of blotting-paper, if it had free will and the natural ability to do so, might keep out of the way of a drop of water.

It is, however, only primary metaphysical principle and evident physical truth (or conclusions *immediately* derived from them) which *compel* the intellect to assent. When reasoning, although absolutely conclusive, is long and involved, the intellect, being unable simultaneously and in one act to grasp the cogency of the reasoning *as a whole*, is not compelled by its own nature to assent to the conclusion.¹ Hence it is that the will must intervene with its command if the intellect is to assent. I wish such assent because it is good—for goodness (*bonum*) is the object sought by the will.² The will may desire truth as good in itself simply because it is good that the intellect shall attain its object which is truth. In regard to all conclusions of this kind the assent given by our intellect is a free act commanded by the will.

It is evident that the conclusions we reach and the line of reasoning we pursue in Apologetics are of this kind. Hence we admit the fact of God's revelation by a free and therefore meritorious act of our will while at the same time the reasoning which establishes that fact is such as to exclude all possibility of the falsity of our conclusion. This freedom of man to accept or reject God's revelation implies another truth of very great moment. Only a well-ordered mind will assent.³ Why we should require a well-ordered

¹ It is scarcely necessary to remark that this applies to metaphysical, physical and moral truth. In the case of "moral" certainty the intellect is *never* compelled to assent, because an involved chain of reasoning is always implied, though scarcely ever expressed. Thus the proposition that fire burns commands immediate assent; but if Mr. Jones tells me there was a tramway accident today, I only give my assent to his statement after reflecting, unconsciously probably, that he is truthful, an alert observer, etc.

² So much, indeed, is the intellect subject to the will that, as we experience daily, people often entertain the firmest convictions on the flimsiest intellectual basis.

³ This point is developed at length by Bishop Hedley in his sermon on "The Way to Believe" in the vol. *The Christian Inheritance*, p. 60.

mind or "good will" to accept religious truth but not for the acceptance of, let us say, the conclusions of mathematics or physics, is sufficiently intelligible. In the first place the acceptance of revelation means accepting irksome obligations and, if there is any possibility of withholding assent (as we have seen there is), men of a disordered or vicious mind will withhold assent. Again, accepting the conclusions of Apologetics implies the acceptance of the truths revealed on the authority of God : and to accept doctrines touching the ultimate values and realities of human existence merely on authority, even though it be the authority of God Himself, is galling to human pride. Lastly, the realities of Faith, to which Apologetics leads, are spiritual and unseen : they are of a different kind from all the things among which we move ; and, since we are attracted more by the things which affect our bodily senses, a distinct effort is required to fix our attention on spiritual realities.¹

Since the assent to the truth of the fact of revelation depends finally, as we have seen, upon the will, it follows that the assent can be stronger in some cases than in others, though in every case, where the motives of assent have been fairly considered and the intellect under the influence of the will has assented, all rational doubt is excluded.

I have been at some pains to insist that what precedes is explanation not proof. It may not be out of place, indeed it may be thought necessary, that some justification should be given of the position taken up.

The revelation of supernatural truth is a purely gratuitous favour from God and is therefore a matter

¹ This applies to spiritual truths which we attain by our unaided reason as well as to those which we know by revelation. In all the cases I have enumerated in which a man refuses to acknowledge truth, which has been proved, the will fails to order the assent of the intellect because some other advantage appears to the will as a greater good. "Good" is *always* the object sought by the will : a mistaken "good" is sought by a disordered will.

of positive fact ; even the revelation of natural religious truth, though morally necessary for us as things are, could have been withheld and made up for in some other way. But it is with the revelation of strictly supernatural truth and ordination that we are chiefly concerned. Since this is a question of positive fact, it is a matter for historical proof : we must search the records. Every other proof or so-called proof falls short. Such "proofs" (e.g. the beauty of the Catholic religion) cannot establish Christianity without making it appear merely natural : if they pretend to have established the fact of a real revelation their *latius hos* must be apparent. Thus Christianity is either misrepresented or discredited by such apologists. So much for the kind of proof. Let us examine the question of the entire exclusion of rational doubt.

If there can be any rational doubt of the fact of God's having spoken to man in the Christian revelation, no act of faith is possible. By this I mean that, if the evidence for the divine origin of the Christian revelation is not entirely conclusive, I cannot accept its dogmas on the authority of God. Thus either the evidence for the Christian revelation is absolutely conclusive or is absolutely worthless in practice. That the evidence in point of fact is absolutely conclusive, I think is patent to any impartial mind and its conclusiveness can very easily be judged by comparison with evidence in other cases, especially historical, where every rational doubt is admittedly excluded.

If we examine the decisions of the Holy See regarding the proofs of revelation and the certainty arising from them, the explanation I have given is not only orthodox but is either explicitly affirmed in those documents or follows from what is there laid down.

According to the Encyclical *Mortalium animos*¹ of

¹ A.A.S., vol. XX (1928), p. 8.

Pius XI the divine origin of Christian revelation is a historical fact.

Now if God has spoken, *and it is proved by the evidence of history that He has spoken*, all must admit that it is man's duty absolutely to believe God's revelation and obey His commands.¹

Miracles and prophecies, which are matters of historical fact, are declared by the Vatican Council to be "most certain signs of divine revelation".²

Few truths have been more carefully safeguarded or more unhesitatingly affirmed by the Holy See in recent times than the historical character and historical trustworthiness of the Gospels, as for instance in the decree *Lamentabili*, nn. 13-18, 36. The same thing is clearly laid down in nn. 3 and 4 of the propositions which Bautain, a Strasburg Professor, was ordered to sign in 1840.

(3) The proof taken from the miracles of Jesus Christ, sensible and striking as it was for eye-witnesses, has in nowise lost its force and splendour for succeeding ages. We find this proof with all certainty in the oral and written tradition of all Christians. It is by this double tradition that we must demonstrate it [i.e. revelation] to those who reject it or who seek it, although they do not yet admit it.

(4) We have no right to ask an unbeliever to admit the Resurrection of Our Divine Saviour until we have placed before him certain proof: this proof is deduced by reasoning from the same tradition.

That faith is impossible unless all rational doubt concerning the fact of revelation is excluded is affirmed by the condemnation (2 March, 1679) of the proposition:

¹ The Encyclical deals with the question of Reunion and the passage quoted is only an assertion made in passing, but it evidently gives the undoubted mind of the Holy See.

² *Constitut. de fide catholica*, Cap. 3 and Can. 3, *de fide*.

Supernatural assent of Faith, conducive to salvation, can be made with only a probable knowledge of revelation or, indeed, with a fear that God has not spoken.

That all rational doubt is excluded is at least implied in all the above pronouncements: it is affirmed in the condemnation of the following proposition by Pius X:

The assent of faith in the ultimate analysis rests upon a mass of probabilities.

The above has been written with the view of stating the Catholic position. But it is evident that in writing I must have had in mind certain erroneous views now prevalent. Direct consideration of these errors has been avoided for the sake of clearness. The question of religious certainty as envisaged by non-Catholics is a difficult one, not rendered easier by the vagueness which characterizes non-Catholic religious writing.

II

As we have seen, we are absolutely certain of a divine revelation in a definite form. We have not pretended to be *proving* the existence of that revelation, but only to be investigating the nature of the certainty with which we hold its existence. The proof is quite another matter. We have seen also that this certainty, which we have said is "moral" certainty, is *absolute* certainty excluding all possibility of the falsity of our conclusion.

If God has given a revelation, we are evidently bound to accept it and assent to it. I am stating this in cold scholastic terms as our present purpose requires. But, even in such a study as the present, it is well for us not to lose sight of the fact that God's

revelation is a great and ennobling gift which it is our privilege as well as our duty to accept from God's goodness. The assent to God's revelation we call divine faith.

As I have already noted, knowledge of things in general comes to us either by an investigation of the things themselves or on the sufficient authority of others. When we accept a truth on what we conceive to be the sufficient authority of another, such assent is faith. It will be human or divine faith as the authority is that of man or of God. The truths contained in divine revelation come to us on the authority of God. Before we proceed further I will give a definition of divine faith. What follows will simply be an explanation of this definition. *The act of faith is the supernatural assent given by the mind, at the bidding of the will and under the influence of grace, to revealed truths by reason of the authority of God Who has revealed them.*¹ Although I am going to explain in detail this definition of faith, I shall not speak of the supernatural character of faith or the part played by grace as that does not directly enter into the question of the certainty of faith.

It must continually be borne in mind that we are not setting out to prove this definition but to explain it. That the faith, without which St. Paul says "it is impossible to please God",² is faith in the sense we are using the word can, of course, be proved from St. Paul, but I do not intend to go into that question.

The first thing to be considered about any intellectual assent is the reason why it is given. Our definition says that the reason for accepting the truths of revelation is the authority of God Who has revealed them. A statement made by another will often not commend our certain assent, but a statement accep-

¹ St. Paul has a famous description of faith (Heb. xi, 1).

² Heb. xi, 6.

ted on the authority of God never admits of rational doubt, since we know (by our reason) that God's knowledge is infinite and that His infinite holiness precludes the possibility of His deceiving us.

This is the doctrine of the Vatican Council.

Since man depends entirely upon God as his Creator and Lord and since created reason is wholly subject to the uncreated Truth, we are bound to render full obedience of intellect and will to God when He reveals. The Catholic Church professes that this faith, which is the beginning of man's salvation, is a supernatural virtue by which, through the inspiration and help of God's grace, we believe all things revealed by Him to be true not because we have perceived their intrinsic truth by the natural light of reason but because of the authority of God Who has revealed and Who can neither deceive nor be deceived.¹

The whole point of what I have been saying is, therefore, that the motive of our faith, or belief in the truths of revelation, is the authority of God Himself. This motive is more sublime than any other could be and gives us *absolute* certainty. But it may very readily be objected that, since Apologetics establishes the fact of revelation and the authority of God, it is this process of reasoning which is ultimately the motive of our faith. Such an assertion, if true, might appear to bring our faith down to a purely human level, sharing the general instability of human affairs. But in reality even were this contention true, it would not detract in the slightest from the absolute objective certainty of our belief. The conclusions established in Apologetics are *absolutely* certain and do not admit of any rational doubt. However, the motive of our faith is the authority of God and not the process of reasoning of Apologetics. It could be said that the assent of faith depended

¹ Vat. Conc., Sess. III, Cap. III, *de fide*.

upon these human arguments and was weakened thereby if Apologetics did not lead to absolute certainty in its conclusion. But given absolute certainty in any conclusion, such a conclusion becomes part of acquired knowledge, and we proceed without further dependence on the preceding arguments. For instance, when a man is sentenced in a criminal court, he is not sentenced on account of the arguments brought forward by counsel. He is sentenced on account of the crime he has committed. So the fact of revelation having been proved up to the hilt we accept and assent to that revelation on the supreme authority of God.

This leads to another controversy and gives the key to it. It is evident that many have neither time nor talent for an exhaustive study of Apologetics: many indeed have not even a convincing knowledge of the fundamental lines of Apologetic argument. Were we not to insist that the motive of faith is the authority of God, we might be led to think that such people, indeed the bulk of the faithful, could not have the same motive of faith as the learned, indeed that they could not have any reasonable motive for their faith at all. On the contrary, however, the motive of faith is the same in the learned and unlearned—namely, the authority of God. Everyone must believe revelation because God has given it, i.e. on the authority of God. People may arrive at this conclusion, i.e. the fact of a divine revelation, by different routes. The objectively conclusive line of argument is of course that followed in sound Apologetics. But there are two classes of people who arrive at the conclusion by other means. In the first place, some people are powerfully attracted by lines of argument which objectively are incomplete and sometimes not objectively conclusive as reasoning. For instance, some find a convincing proof of the truth of Catholicism in its wonderful and complete

fulfilment of the best aspirations of human nature. Secondly, some take the fact of revelation on the authority of those whom they know to have conscientiously studied the matter: generally such authority is confirmed and strengthened in their mind by other considerations, such as, for instance, the absence of any constant standard of doctrine outside the Catholic Church, the Church's defence of morality, etc. Certainty arrived at by such means is real certainty, although it is so only for minds of a particular type, in the case of the first class of people to whom I referred: or, in the case of the second class, for people who are compelled by the force of circumstances habitually to act on the finding of experts. It is not a just taunt that the faith of probably the majority of Catholics rests on an apologetic basis which is not, objectively speaking, complete and sound. The complete, intellectual, basis of the Catholic Church is there for anyone to examine and the position of the Catholic Church is intellectually flawless and certain. As regards individuals, we must remember that the Church is not a society of learned professors but of souls to be saved. Before individuals can believe, they must be certain that God has spoken. But, once they know for certain that God has spoken, they believe on His authority and the motive of faith, the authority of God, is the same for all—learned and unlearned—and the certainty is the same.

Regarding the part played by the will in the act of faith. I have already remarked that when there is question of a truth arrived at by a more or less complicated process of reasoning, or of a truth accepted on sufficient authority, the evidence does not compel the intellect to assent even when that evidence is absolutely conclusive. Let us apply this now to faith. The truths of faith are accepted on the authority of God; they are therefore not such as in themselves compel the assent of the intellect.

Hence, although the motive for assent is fully sufficient, the will must command the intellect to assent. It clearly follows also from this that the act of faith is a free act. Furthermore, being a free act, faith can become more intense at the desire of the will.

In all the foregoing I have considered the intellectual process of the approach to faith and of faith itself in an abstract manner and as an objective process. I have not dealt at all with the question of the necessity of grace in the *pius affectus credulitatis* or in the *initium fidei* or in faith itself, whether this last be considered as an act or as a *habitus*. As I have not discussed this matter at all, it would be quite beside the point for anyone to suggest that I deny the necessity of grace. I do hold, as the definitions of the Church compel me to hold, that grace is necessary in each of these steps. But the necessity of grace for an individual to make an effective approach to the faith and to elicit the act of faith does not in the least detract from the objective conclusiveness of our apologetic reasoning or from the objective certainty of faith itself altogether apart from grace. Grace is not required in order to make up for any weakness of argument, but is necessary for other reasons. I may on some future occasion, if the Editor will accord me the hospitality of these pages, deal with the part played by grace and with the supernatural character of the act and virtue of faith.

ALPHONSUS BONNAR, O.F.M.

HOMILETICS

Third Sunday after Easter

(The Month of May and Devotion to Our Lady)

THE Month of May—the Month of Mary. Why? It is not possible to say exactly how and when the Month of May first became dedicated to Our Lady, but no evidence is needed to demonstrate how firm a hold this devotion has taken upon the hearts of Catholics. One of the things that no Catholic can forget is that May is the Month of Mary. However negligent a man becomes in the practice of his faith, no Sunday morning will pass without his adverting to the obligation of Sunday Mass; and, similarly, no one who has had any definite Catholic training will need to be reminded, when the earth is putting on her fresh springtime loveliness in May, that this month belongs in some special way to the holy Mother of God. There are other seasons in the year which are quite as beautiful—nay, more beautiful: the full glory of nature is never seen until summer flowers are in bloom and the trees in full foliage. “Not because it is best, but because it is first”: here, in the words of Cardinal Newman, is the reason for May’s dedication to Mary.

Man’s longing for happiness, the hope that “springs eternal” and is the “waking man’s dream”, is founded upon promise, and ultimately upon the promise of God that man may possess, if he will, a happiness that will last for ever. Very early in the history of our race man forfeited his right to eternal happiness, to any happiness. That ugly thing, sin, hitherto unknown upon the earth, had come; and in the place of the bright lamp of hope which had filled with warmth and light the hearts of our first parents, a dark shadow of despair had descended to envelop their lives with misery. Frightened by the magnitude of their crime, they hid themselves from the wrath of God, but He called them forth from their hiding-place for confession and punishment. One cannot imagine the depth of their unhappiness as they stood side by side, their heads bent low in shame and dread and terror: and one

cannot picture the extent of their gratitude and joy as they lifted their eyes and hands in speechless wonder at the dawn of a new hope when every hope seemed lost. The dreaded sentence, the demand of justice, was being tempered by the sweet mercy of their Maker. He was giving them a promise. He was speaking of a Redeemer and of the Woman who would bear Him. She must come first, then He would follow ; she was the Promise, as He would be the fulfilment. How they must have dreamed and talked of her ! What a beautiful picture she must have made in their minds, this wonderful Mother of hope renewed !

Whilst it is never prudent to read into the Scriptures more than they are supposed to tell us, it is not unreasonable to attribute to the men and women of the Bible the thoughts and feelings natural to mankind. We may reasonably suppose that the Woman of Promise was spoken of in the earliest days from one generation to another. The remembrance of God's pledged word would come most readily to the mind when the earth itself was brightening with the promise of springtime, when new crops were breaking through the soil, when the lambs of the flock, the budding shrubs and trees, and the nesting birds were promising a future of plenty and gladsome peace. This assuredly would be the season when there would come most readily to the minds of the pious God's words of promise regarding the Redeemer and the Woman who should bear Him.

The great fact of the Incarnation, in which Our Blessed Lady filled so vital a part, is the central event of human history. The annals of Old Testament times, before Christ came, reveal an air of expectancy, an atmosphere of watching and waiting for the coming Messias, as we may see from the words of ardent longing uttered by the Prophets. Isaias was the most privileged mouthpiece of the Almighty in those far-off days ; and as he gazed down the long arches of time, seeing in prophetic vision the Child, the Prince of Peace, he doubtless caught some glimpse also of the Virgin Mother who was to bring forth that Child. He would not see her for all that she was, nor understand her ever-growing greatness in God's scheme of things. He would not realize

that, when his own prophecy had come to fulfilment and the Child had come into His Kingdom, the Mother would hold so resplendent a place in His court. Nevertheless, more clearly than any other Prophet did Isaias foresee the Most Blessed amongst all women.

As the Church teaches us, Mary our Lady, from the very beginning, was known in some degree to God's chosen people, to whom she was imaged forth in the long line of fair and noble women whose names shine so brightly in the records of those times. There were always those who would recall something of God's words to the Serpent : "I will put enmities between thee and the woman, and thy seed and her seed : she shall crush thy head, and thou shalt lie in wait for her heel." The woman of this prophecy was obviously to be a strong and valiant and virtuous woman. Occasionally men might have thought that she was actually come, when they beheld someone who did in fact but foreshadow her. They saw in Eve, the mother of all the living, something to remind them of a new motherhood that would bring the Redeemer to the world. Mary was dimly beheld also in the comeliness of Rebecca, in the devotion of Rachel, in the benign humanity of Miriam, in the tender loyalty of Ruth, in the prudence of Abigail, in the queenly power of Bethsabée, in the courage of the valiant Judith, in the efficacious pleading of Esther. As these wonderful women appeared one after another in the course of time, each added something to the completion of the primal promise. They followed each other like the brightening days which bring hope to the world as winter falls away and spring emerges. They mark the gradual disappearance of the darkest age of man which was at last to be superseded by the springtime of that glorious light which was to be a revelation to the Gentiles and the glory of God's people.

Before the Child could be born, first must come the Mother, as the Morning Star to herald the rising of the Sun of Justice. How greatly God's angels must have rejoiced at her birth ! They then knew that man's redemption was at hand, that with the creation of this perfect, peerless creature, the days of promise would give place to the time of wondrous fulfilment, when they, the heavenly

messengers, would come to earth with their good tidings of great joy to sing their *Gloria in Excelsis*. That day has come and gone. Jesus Christ, mankind's divine Redeemer, has been born among men, but He has not gone with the passing of time, as have others who have entered this world. He remains, our Emmanuel, ever with us ; and although the long promised Virgin Mother came and brought forth this Saviour, although she lived upon the earth and passed through the portals of death into eternity, yet she also remains with us, even as does her Son our Saviour.

When, with each new year of time, the month of May returns to gladden the earth with renewed loveliness, bringing the promise of summer sunshine and rich harvest, then it is that there comes to our minds the thought of Mary and of all that she means to us. She was the Woman of Promise to our first parents and to those who came after them until the Incarnation was an accomplished fact : they looked forward to her coming. We in our day look back to Bethlehem, and beyond, to that happy day when her sweet presence first graced this earth. Our joy is greater than that of the first generations of men, because we know her and possess her for what she is, the Mother of our Redeemer and our own heavenly Mother also, by whose prayers we shall at last know perfect happiness in that eternal kingdom where every hope and promise is fulfilled.

Fourth Sunday after Easter

"Behold from henceforth all generations shall call me blessed"

For the ordinary Catholic it is unnecessary to assign to these words a place in the Holy Scriptures : as soon as they are spoken they are recognized as part of Our Lady's *Magnificat*, that glorious canticle of faith and joy, of praise and pleading, which arose to heaven in soaring splendour from Mary's lips, when for sheer ecstasy she broke her accustomed silence and woke the echoes of Judea's hill country. Yes : the words are known immediately for the

words of Mary's *Magnificat* ; but how seldom do people advert to the fact that these words contain a wonderful prophecy ! Brought up as a child in the precincts of the Temple, Mary was well acquainted with the utterances of the great Hebrew Prophets. Perhaps there sometimes came to her, even in her tenderest years, some dawning fear—or joy—as to the identity of the "Virgin Daughter of Sion" spoken of by Isaias and Jeremias. All too soon she was to hear from the lips of Holy Simeon the sad warning of her coming sorrows. Now, however, as she magnifies the greatness of her God, there seems to be no room in her heart for anything but unalloyed happiness. It is the Holy Spirit who inspires her to utter these words, unsurpassed by even the Psalmist ; and set in the midst of them, the loveliest, richest notes in this rare song, is a prophecy unique in content as it is unique in fulfilment : "Behold from henceforth all generations shall call me blessed."

Here is a wonderful thought : each time we say the "Hail Mary" we help to fulfil more surely Our Lady's prophetic words. "Blessed art thou among women", we cry, invoking her sweet name above that of all others, calling her "Blessed" in our generation, as did our forefathers in theirs. So will it be until the end of time. "All generations," she said : and in every age since her own has her word come true, for there has never been one day, one hour, since the world has known Christianity, when human voices have not been lifted in glad benediction of the greatest of all God's creatures.

An idea may be gained of the unique character of Mary's prophecy by considering the numberless occasions upon which it has been fulfilled by her children in the recitation of the Rosary. To say, in a well-loved Irish phrase, the "round of the beads" once, is to call her "Blessed" fifty times. When a congregation of five hundred people assembled in church recites this devotion in common, God's Holy Mother is hailed as "Blessed" twenty-five thousand times. And when in a large city church, during a Mission, for instance (and one has frequently known this) two thousand voices are united in one grand chorus to bless the name of Mary, it means that her prophecy is being fulfilled a hundred-thousand times in one quarter of

an hour ! There comes a time, however, when figures cease to have any definite meaning. It would be utterly impossible to compute the number of occasions when, in the use of the "Hail Mary" alone, Our Lady is proclaimed as "Blessed" in one city or country or continent during one hour or day. Every moment of time is somewhere sanctified by this beautiful prayer, and so has it been for hundreds of years. Truly may it be said that there is no prophecy in the whole of the Scriptures more marvellously fulfilled than this of Mary's *Magnificat*, for the humblest and the highest alike prove the truth of her words by their universal benediction of this purest of creatures in the use of the "Hail Mary".

Yes : wherever Catholics assemble for the Rosary, and whatever differences there be among them in station or culture or education, they are on common and familiar ground in the recitation of this prayer. To non-Catholics, however, it usually presents a great difficulty. One has often heard remarks such as this, when a Protestant has been coaxed into attending Evening Devotions : "I liked some of it, you know, but I cannot understand the Rosary ; it's all 'Hail Mary', 'Hail Mary'. Why not more of God, and less of the Virgin Mary ?" One must sympathize with this attitude of mind, because to the majority of non-Catholic Christians Our Lady means next to nothing. They sometimes pray to individual saints, to St. Paul or the Apostles or particular patrons, but their devotion to St. Mary Our Lady is practically non-existent. Having never in reality made her acquaintance, they are persuaded, perhaps for the first time in their lives, to be present at a Catholic service : the Rosary is recited, and they are bewildered by "Hail Mary", "Hail Mary", to the apparent exclusion of Almighty God. One should always be direct and simple when dealing with the difficulties of non-Catholics ; let us deal with this one, by offering an immediate solution, in some such way as the following.

"Hail Mary, full of grace, the Lord is with thee, blessed art thou among women." Far from being "All Mary", these words are in a true sense "All God". We say the Lord's Prayer with so great a sense of security, certain that our words are perfectly chosen and perfectly pleasing

to Almighty God, because they were given to us from the lips of His own Son, our Saviour, Himself divine. But these words of our prayer to Mary are also from God, a message brought from heaven to earth at His bidding. How, then, can we pray better than with these words given to Gabriel by the Almighty? We do but repeat what was spoken by the heavenly messenger "sent from God into a city of Galilee, called Nazareth, to a virgin espoused to a man whose name was Joseph, of the house of David; and the virgin's name was Mary". Proceeding with our petition, we say: "And blessed is the fruit of thy womb, Jesus." This is "All Jesus", as the first phrase was "All God": we are blessing our divine Redeemer. It is true that we mention Mary's motherhood, but only in passing, as it were; the actual invocation is of Him who is our Redeemer. The first part of the "Hail Mary" is therefore seen to be in reality "All God" and not "All Mary", as at first one might think. The rest of the prayer likewise gives to Mary only the secondary place which she loves, and which her humility makes so beautiful.

"Holy Mary, Mother of God." At once it is clear where our minds are—with God, and that we are but calling upon His Holy Mother because of her power with Him. If, as St. Paul assures us, "God heareth the man that doth His will", He will undoubtedly hear this one, whom He has endowed with such high holiness, and who did His will so well during every moment of her life. He Himself has told the world, has made known by the message of an angel that Mary of Nazareth pleased Him quite perfectly, for He pronounced her "full of grace". What a stupendous truth, that a creature should be *perfectly* pleasing to the omnipotent mind of the eternal God! Hence do we call upon her, begging that she will pray for us "now and at the hour of our death". It is unnecessary to say how much we are in need of help now, when our lives are darkened by sorrow in the absence or death of dear ones, by the destruction of our homes and churches, by fear and foreboding of what the future may hold for us. Anyone's prayers at the present moment are a comfort to us; how much, then, should we not value the prayers of God's greatest servant, Our Lady! Yes: we ask her to plead with Him for us

now, and also when we are dying, when we await our summons to the judgement-seat of God. Then indeed shall we need a powerful advocate to plead our cause. If Mary prays for us at the hour of death, we need not fear, because St. Paul tells us that God will listen to her, in that she never for one moment failed to do His holy will from first to last.

Although it is true, then, that the "Hail Mary" is so unfamiliar, so foreign, to the non-Catholic mind, it can quite easily be made the means of approach to a better understanding of the truths of our holy Faith. Its sweet reasonableness as a prayer can quickly be demonstrated to even the most prejudiced of Protestants. One could wish to hear no happier words from a convert than these : "It was the 'Hail Mary' that brought me into the Church." Such words imply that by a direct introduction to the angelic salutation someone whose voice would otherwise have been silent has been taught to raise it and to help in the fulfilment of that glorious prophecy enshrined in the *Magnificat*, that men throughout all ages should call Our Lady "Blessed".

When Mary proclaimed that her blessedness would be upon the lips of all generations, perhaps she saw in prophetic vision a picture of mankind in the ages of Christianity. Perhaps she beheld God's children assembled in their homes and churches and chapels, and at such great shrines as Lourdes, endlessly repeating the angel's "Ave" : and we may hope that she saw each of us among those throngs of the faithful. God grant that we may love always to take our place in that wonderful picture, never tiring of this so precious part of our Catholic devotion. Then at the last our fidelity will bring us to the courts of Paradise, where we shall see that prophecy reach the perfection of its fulfilment, with God's saints and angels about the throne of their Queen witnessing to her greatness and eternally setting forth the truth of the words with which the Holy Spirit inspired her : "Behold from henceforth all generations shall call me blessed."

Fifth Sunday after Easter

Our Lady's Dowry

By a quite natural process there evolved during the Ages of Faith a roll of honour upon which was inscribed a particular title for each of the countries of Christendom. These titles were not of studied and deliberate choice : each of them arose out of the genius of a people, the characteristics of a race. All the world knew of "Most Catholic Spain", of "France, the eldest daughter of the Church", of "Holy Ireland" ; and all the world likewise knew our own land as "Our Lady's Dowry". It was recognized as a fitting title, and our predecessors were proud in the knowledge that they were spoken of by their fellow-Christians throughout the world for their devotion to God's Holy Mother. Then came that sad, unhappy day when the Reformation changed the religion of the northern lands, and ours among them. England was robbed of her heritage. In place of the ancient worship which had come from the Apostles, she was given another system of religion. A curtain was drawn to hide the rich and varied scene of Catholic Christianity. A new outlook was planned, a new picture presented to the people ; and in that picture Our Lady found no place.

To the ordinary non-Catholic of the man-in-the-street type it comes as a surprise to learn that there was a day when every Englishman was a Catholic, when every church was the shrine of an altar stone, when Mary Our Lady was universally known and loved throughout the land. For the most part our Protestant brethren think about "The Virgin" as someone invented by the Catholic Church, someone who takes the place which rightly belongs to Our Lord. If men would only believe it, she is but standing where her divine Son has set her, on His own right hand, before all saints and angels, the highest and holiest of heavenly creatures, as she was first and foremost among creatures of earth. Such was the inherited faith of ordinary Englishmen five hundred years ago ; and so well did they practise what they believed, so deep and true and fervent was their devotion to Mary,

that they earned for their land that beautiful title : "Our Lady's Dowry".

There is still much evidence of what Mary meant to England long ago, despite the systematic destruction of her ancient shrines. One need hardly leave the highway of ordinary travel to discover proof of the place she held in the religious life of the land. Readily there comes to the mind, for instance, the wonderful mediaeval glass of Fairford. To stand in this fine old church (it is dedicated to Mary) is like being inside a colossal lantern, for one is completely surrounded by glorious stained-glass windows, windows wherein Our Lady is frequently depicted. The marvellous fourteenth-century miniature of the Annunciation at Wells Cathedral is a great surprise to Protestants, who do not realize that Lady Day was kept in bygone times. They likewise look in astonishment at the fine "Assumption" in Llandaff Cathedral, painted in the fifteenth century, and inscribed by Bishop Marshall, who then ruled the diocese :

O Virgo scandens
Sis Marshall coelica pandens.

The lovely Cotswold town of Chipping Campden has many a relic of its Catholic past. Its noble church, built by the munificence of the great mediaeval wool merchants, is the only church in the country still using a pre-Reformation cope and a set of pre-Reformation altar frontals. As the obliging churchwarden opened the case where the cope was kept, he asked, pointing to a beautifully embroidered figure : "Can you see who that is, sir?" "Yes ; it's Our Blessed Lady with the Divine Child in her arms." "That's right : the Virgin and Child. Some people think it is a miracle, because that panel is so bright and the others are so faded." "It may be," I replied ; "but the explanation may rather lie in the fact that much more trouble was taken in working the figure of Our Lady, she being so much greater a saint than any of those in the other panels." Then I was led to a wall case in which was preserved a complete set of altar frontals, in the liturgical colours that we know so well today. The white frontal was the one on view. "Can you see the figure in the centre, sir?" "Yes ; it's Our Lady again, but without the Child in her arms

this time." "Can you make out the words round the figure, sir?" This was not easy for a moment or two. Some of the words were abbreviated, but they suddenly read quite clearly : "Assumpta est Maria in coelum." My guide corroborated the statement, saying that he had been taught the words in order that he might repeat them to visitors. "Do you know what they mean?" I asked. He did not ; so I told him. I also told him where they came from, and that if he went to the local Catholic church on 15 August he would hear the priest at the altar saying them during the Holy Sacrifice of the Mass, just as in the days before the Reformation the priest would have said them at the altar in this fine old church. "To whom is the church dedicated?" I asked. "St. James," he said, and then added : "But it wasn't always : before the Dissolution it was St. Mary." "I don't think our Divine Saviour could be pleased with that," I said ; "that men should strike out His own mother's name from the porch of this church and replace it by that of someone else, even though he be an Apostle." Unhappily the case of Chipping Campden can be paralleled by a hundred others.

In pre-Reformation England there were twice as many churches dedicated to Our Blessed Lady as to any other saint. She was revered throughout the land as the perfect woman, the heavenly pattern for Christian womanhood in sanctity, loyalty, purity, patience. England was once an Island of Saints, and it was devotion to Our Lady that largely made it so, for the girls and women of the land modelled their lives upon the life of Mary. Purity was then valued as the first virtue of a good woman's life : to be chaste was to be like Our Lady. Here is the testimony of that very Protestant historian, Lecky : "The world is governed by its ideals, and seldom or never has there been one which has exercised a more profound and, on the whole, a more salutary influence than the mediaeval conception of the Virgin. For the first time woman was elevated to her rightful position, and the sanctity of weakness was recognized as well as the sanctity of sorrow. No longer the slave or toy of man, no longer associated only with ideas of degradation or sensuality, woman rose, in the person of the Virgin Mother, into a new sphere, and became

the object of a reverential homage of which antiquity had had no conception. Love was idealized. The moral charm and beauty of female excellence was fully felt. A new type of character was called into being ; a new kind of admiration was fostered. Into a harsh and ignorant and benighted age this ideal type infused a conception of gentleness and purity unknown to the proudest civilizations of the past. . . . All that was best in Europe clustered round it, and it is the origin of many of the purest elements of our civilization." How different is the world of today !

Happily, however, the old ideals of chastity still obtain among Catholics, where Mary our Lady is loved and revered. As Cardinal Newman says, it is devotion to Mary that can keep the young heart chaste. In the Catholic Church, permeated as it is by the sweet inspiring presence of the Purest of Creatures, there still flourishes that love of chastity that germinates saints. In Mary, our girls—of whatever station—have the one pattern of perfect womanhood. She is to them the inspiration of all that is best and noblest in feminine character, and in particular of that angelic virtue which raises the human heart so near to heaven.

Will our land ever again deserve the title of "Our Lady's Dowry"? There is no doubt that we are witnessing a new reaching out to the things that are spiritual, a revived appreciation of those fundamental principles by which Western civilization must stand or fall, a longing for that sense of security which filled the hearts of our forefathers in the days when there arose from end to end of the land those monuments of peace, our mediaeval cathedrals. It is from these glorious buildings that one bright gleam of hope shines out to remind us that Our Lady still has her place, however humble, upon the lips of our Anglican brethren. Each day from these hallowed shrines there rises in our own beautiful tongue—and sung as only English cathedral choirs can sing them—some wonderful words. Probably the choristers do not advert to whose words they are. Perhaps the fair form of her who first sang them never shapes itself in their minds as they raise their voices in the *Magnificat*, but the words themselves day by day ring out in all their beauty, even as Mary herself prophesied they

would : "Behold from henceforth all generations shall call me blessed." May she listen to them, and look down in pity and in love upon the land once so dear to her, awakening in the hearts of her English children that Faith in which, next to her Divine Son, she, His humble handmaid and His Holy Mother, holds the place of highest honour.

Sunday within the Octave of the Ascension

Our Lady of Perpetual Succour

"Our Lady of Perpetual Succour" : this is the title of the world's most popular and best-loved picture of the ever holy Mother of God. For centuries the invocation was upon the lips of the faithful who visited the shrine of this famous picture in the church of St. Matthew in Rome ; but in the year 1798, when the army of Napoleon descended upon the Eternal City and swept away so many of its treasures, this precious image of the miraculous Virgin Mother was caught up in the flood of destruction and disappeared from sight. The story of how it was at length recovered, to be restored by Pope Pius IX to the rebuilt church which had been its home for three hundred years, is a rare instance of how the strangeness of truth makes fiction seem commonplace.¹

There are many reasons for the world-wide popularity of this picture ; its simplicity, its beautiful colouring, its deeply Catholic tone, its vivid portrayal of Our Lady's protective power. Other pictures of the Madonna sometimes pall with the passing of time ; this one—never. Familiarity makes it ever more dear. It is the first in favour among priests in every land, and it has steadily obtained a permanent place in the hearts and homes of the entire people of Ireland : two facts that speak eloquently of its genuine Catholic character as a sacred image. It was, we are told, the favourite picture of Bernadette, the Saint who shares with the Little Flower the place of greatest importance in the history of modern France, and who was privileged to gaze in vision upon the face of the Immacu-

¹ See *The Mother of Perpetual Succour*, by the Rev. W. Raemers, C.S.S.R. C.T.S. Liverpool. 2d.

late. There is a deep significance in the fact that it was not the picture of "Our Lady of Lourdes" that appealed to Bernadette, but that of "Our Lady of Perpetual Succour".

All the extant documentary evidence regarding this picture seems to point to the fact that it has preserved the earliest manner of representing Our Blessed Lady, a tradition that probably had its origin in the hands of St. Luke. The Evangelist knew Our Lady. From her own lips he had the story of the birth and infancy of Jesus. One can imagine how thoroughly he absorbed every word spoken by this "Maiden of Beautiful Memory", as she described those days of ecstatic joy, when she was so happy with her lovely child in her arms. St. Luke did not need Mary's words to tell him of her sorrows; these were depicted on her holy countenance, and some of them he doubtless witnessed. True, he was not at the foot of the Cross for that last sad scene, when Mary's arms again enfolded her Son, now grown to man's estate and crucified for a sinful world: the same mother, but no longer the joyful mother of Bethlehem and Nazareth. St. Luke did not share with the Beloved Disciple the privilege of witnessing this final meeting of Mother and Son; yet in the years that followed he was favoured to know Mary in her loneliness and grief. It was natural, therefore, when he took up his artist's brush to make her portrait, that he should show her as the Mother of Sorrows.

In a memorable sermon Cardinal Newman has reminded us that "all the glories of Mary are for the sake of her Son". It is likewise true that all her sorrows are for His sake also. The picture of Our Lady of Perpetual Succour is a picture of Our Lady of Sorrows. It represents the Divine Child, startled at a vision of the instruments of His Passion, turning and clinging to His Mother, whose strong, tender arms are eager to shield and succour Him. It is the proof of Mary's protective power of her Child which gives this picture such a sure appeal to the hearts of her other children. It is upon them that her eyes are fixed, not upon her Divine Son. She looks out of the picture as though to inspire them with confidence when they turn to her in their tribulations, trials and tears. In the same way that she named herself "Immaculate" to Bernadette,

so also to another faithful child did she give to herself the title of "Mary of Perpetual Succour", as the marvellous history of the picture tells us. Always has she merited this title ; she could never betray the trust given to her by her Son from the cross. The history of Christianity is the history of how men and women during the past two thousand years have found in Mary their hope, their sweetness and their very life. She has been their sure refuge in grief and sorrow, because they have relied upon her mother's love and understanding. Let me recount one of the loveliest legends in the Marian annals, the story of something that took place in our own land long ago in the ages of faith, when Mary proved herself to be most truly a Mother of Perpetual Succour.

A little boy had been taught by his mother to say Our Lady's name. When he was born he had seemed like other children, but all too soon it became evident that he would probably develop into what a later and less Christian age would call the village idiot. One can imagine the grief and disappointment of his mother when she saw other babies growing into bright intelligent children whilst her own son remained dull and backward. Her friends sympathized with her ; she became the saddened mother of that village community. Her child would never learn to read and write, nor could he speak ; but the wise mother, after long and patient effort, taught him at last to say two words : "Hail Mary". Since this was all he could say, he said it very frequently. One can imagine a party of old-time hikers arriving at the crossroads, and enquiring their way to the next village from the little boy wandering about alone whilst the rest of the children were in school. His answer would be "Hail Mary". If anyone asked him his name, or where he lived, or where the inn was, "Hail Mary" would be all the information forthcoming. In his lonely games he could be heard with his "Hail Mary", "Hail Mary", when other children would have been chanting their nursery rhymes. He used to amuse himself by clinging to the overhanging branch of a tree and swinging from side to side of a little stream, saying each time his feet fell upon the bank : "Hail Mary", "Hail Mary".

One day, quite suddenly, the little fellow died. The other children sang the Mass of the Angels, and the "Hail Mary" boy was buried in the churchyard, surrounded by the villagers, who felt his loss more deeply than any of them would have thought possible. Meekly his grieving mother bowed her head to God's will, thinking that it was perhaps better for her boy to die thus early than that he should grow into a frustrated and disabled manhood.

Whilst the sexton was neatly arranging the earth over the child's grave he noticed a small green shoot at one end of it, and was duly surprised, for he had seen no bulb or seedling whilst he was filling in the earth. Very soon the villagers who had gone quietly and sadly to their homes came trooping back to the churchyard to see this strange thing, a plant growing quite rapidly as they watched. By Angelus time they saw it for what it was : it had grown as tall as the child himself had been, and had blossomed into a beautiful lily. The people asked the sexton to dig around its roots and show them how it was growing. Very tenderly with his trowel he parted the earth, laying bare once more the face of the buried child. Then the mystery was solved : everyone saw that the lily was springing from the little boy's lips.

What a happy surprise for the beholders, especially for the child's mother ! Her afflicted little son, whom all had pitied, was suddenly seen to be the most privileged one of the community ; and his mother, whose heart had been heavy with disappointment that he had not been like other children, and with whom her neighbours had sympathized in her sorrow—she had now become the most blessed among all the women of that countryside. Her trust in Our Lady had been wondrously rewarded. She had been sustained during the years of her sorrow by the certainty that Mary, the Mother of Sorrows, would understand and help her ; and this Mother of Perpetual Succour had suddenly shown how lovingly she had watched over the crippled child whose only words had been her own holy name. Except for his repeated "Hail Mary", "Hail Mary", he had been speechless, dumb ; but now he was preaching a most eloquent sermon upon the glorious theme that no one who has recourse to Mary can be forsaken.

At the present moment it is not a handful of suffering souls that appeals to Mary, not even a group of afflicted nations ; it is an afflicted world. From five continents those who know and love Our Lady—whatever their racial differences—are pleading with her that strife may be ended and that men may again know tranquillity of life. Those who lived through the Great War of a quarter of century ago never thought to see another and a greater struggle being waged ; for many of them the fresh outbreak of hostilities has brought the severest test their faith has ever known. They see great Catholic nations opposing one another, with an apparent disregard of Christian principles ; they know that from every town in the belligerent countries earnest men and women are turning to the Mother of their Saviour asking her to intercede with Him that war may cease and the unspeakable sufferings of the innocent mercifully end. They know too that Mary's children in every one of the opposing nations are praying to her, not only for peace, but also for victory. How can she answer their prayers ? How can she possibly reconcile their apparently irreconcilable differences ? Never did such problems torment men's minds, never was human belief in divine love so strained as now. We live in a day of appalling possibilities, of tremendous issues ; but it is our day, our time, and we must live through it bravely. In our beautiful Catholic Faith we have the only sure anchor in the fierce storm that is sweeping round the world, and whilst that faith remains to us we may know that every dawn—however dark the sky—is brightened by the hopeful shining of that fair Morning Star, the Virgin Mother of our God Incarnate. She will bring us peace at last. "O Mother of Perpetual Succour, hasten to the aid of thy helpless children : Amen."

LAWRENCE HULL, C.S.S.R.

DOCTRINE FOR CHILDREN

I

THE PRIEST IN THE CLASSROOM

THE gradual encroachment of the State upon the domain of education means that an army of officials tend to usurp the responsibilities of the parents and of the Church. It may also mean that parents gradually surrender their authority over their children, leaving the Church to defend the rights of home and school against the encroaching officials.

It is therefore of the utmost importance not only that we as priests should hold our position in the school, but also that we should be able to teach efficiently. The Church certainly expects her priests to be able to catechize both the faithful in general, and children in particular, as is evident from Canon 1329 and the following canons.

A priest faced for the first time by a class of children of the average age, say, of twelve years, may be excused if he feels some trepidation, especially if the class is a mixed one (an unfortunate arrangement, but perhaps inevitable). Nevertheless, if he has taken some trouble to prepare himself, his *gratia status* will carry him through any difficulties. His vocation is to "go and teach" and his model must be Christ the Teacher.

As Pius XI remarks towards the close of the Encyclical on the Christian Education of Youth, "Christ is the model for all education". On reflection one becomes convinced that Our Lord is the most perfect of schoolmasters.

(1) He uses simple words adapted to the minds of His hearers. He drives home His point by means of familiar stories or parables one after the other, all for the one purpose of making His meaning clear. ("Again the Kingdom of Heaven is like a net.") His stories are never pointless.

(2) He does not do all the talking ; He encourages the pupils to think ; He draws them on and asks questions : *What thinkest thou ? Which of the two loveth him most ? Whose image and superscription is this ?* They soon begin to respond : *Good Master, what must I do to be saved ? Teach us how to pray. Expound to us the parable.*

(3) He does not try to rivet attention upon Himself the whole time—a common fault with some teachers. He changes the focus of attention. He sets a small child in the midst of them ; He points to the widow putting her mite in the alms box ; He shows them a lily ; He holds up a coin ; He writes in the sand (in default of a blackboard) ; He points to the sower.

(4) He is grave, unhurried and dignified, never frivolous nor free. *And when He had folded the book, He restored it to the minister and sat down. And the eyes of all in the synagogue were fixed on Him and He began to say to them . . .*

(5) He frequently quotes Scripture and even local proverbs (*Doctor, cure thyself*), but not pagan writers.

(6) He gives presents and thinks of the material needs of His pupils ; loaves, fishes, honeycomb, a fire of coals on the beach. He visits their homes and their sick. He gives special attention to individuals, e.g. Nicodemus.

Is it possible in practice to imitate Our Lord's method of teaching? *Ab esse ad posse valet illatio*. The best example of such imitation in modern times may be found in the "Catechisms" of the Curé of Ars (of which copious extracts are given in the Life translated by Fr. Wolferstan, S.J.). The simplicity and charm of these catechisms drew multitudes to learn from the lips of the saintly parish priest. His methods were simply those of Our Lord.

The Church herself, the great teacher and mother of men, continues the methods of her Master through the ages. These methods live in her Liturgy, ever ancient, ever new. She uses the Scriptures unceasingly.

She wishes all her pupils to sing, to speak, as well as to listen. She enacts her lesson before their eyes. She shows them pictures, coloured windows, statues. She gives individual attention in the confessional and at the Communion rails. She visits their sick. She gives presents, palms, candles, medals. She has ceremonies and blessings for every human need. It is to be noted that in all the marvellous variety of her liturgical life she is constantly teaching : she certainly does not confine her teaching to the official sermon from the pulpit, the teacher's desk. She teaches even while she prays.

This liturgical method of education is exactly suited to

human nature and can be likened to the constant instruction given by good parents to their children in the home. Now, the school, says Pius XI in the Encyclical on Christian Education, is an extension of the home under the maternal protection of the Church. "The Church and the home are in reality but one temple of Christian education." It is therefore to be expected that the methods of teaching common to the Church and the home will find their echo in the classrooms.

Good pedagogy will seek its inspiration from Church and home. Church, home and school are the perfect trinity of education. The priest may be regarded as the unifying principle of this trinity. In the eyes of the Catholic child the priest is intimately connected with Church, home and school for he is the spiritual father of the three domains. It follows that the priest by his very vocation ought to be an ideal teacher ; and he can become so if he will but form his methods of instruction upon the model of the Liturgy which has developed from the educational examples of Christ, "the model of all teachers".

Religious doctrine, if it is taught solely as part of the school syllabus, may come to be regarded by the child as a mere preparation for "exams", an effort to make the class do well, a subject to be abandoned after school time.

Religious doctrine taught after the manner of the Liturgy links home and Church with school life, especially if the priest takes his due share in the teaching. The family spirit of the Church and the home ought to invade the classroom. This Catholic atmosphere is a delightful, intangible thing. It expresses itself in a thousand ways : in the little altars, the various feasts, novenas, decorations, class devotions varying with the seasons, all of which are echoes of the Liturgy. For example, the consecration ceremony before the picture of the Sacred Heart, in June, is worth far more than many pages of the Catechism learnt by heart and not understood.

Our Catholic teachers (especially the women) seem to realize these things by instinct. The result is that the Faith transforms even a slum school into a child's paradise where the priest is as welcome as Christ in the home.

The liturgical method of instruction takes as its syllabus

the current feasts of the Church which can be made to cover the whole field of Christian doctrine. It uses every means approved by the Church for reaching the heart and soul of the child, e.g. stories, devotion, gifts, processions, drama, blackboard pictures, hymns and so forth. All these things concern the current season or feast and elucidate the lessons connected with it. In this way the school works in harmony with Church and home where the same feast is also being observed. Thus the child becomes aware of the unity of Church, home and school. Religious doctrine is then no longer a detached school subject to be cast from the mind after school, but a living and practical reality affecting every aspect of the child's life. That this is possible is clear when one considers how the joys of the Christmas season, for example, dominate a child's life in the Church, in the classroom and in the home. If the school were to disregard the feast and to concentrate the attention of the children upon some other point of doctrine there would be an unpleasant sense of jarring. Much of the thrill and joy of the season is to be found in the perfect unison of home, Church and school, all conspiring to re-enact the Nativity of Christ.

In varying degrees this could be done throughout the year, without in any way hindering the customary catechism lesson given by the teacher.

II

LESSONS FOR MAY

The month of May offers some good opportunities for illustrating the method, *mutatis mutandis*. Four days are chosen as samples without any apology for the simplicity of the language used. The pictures mentioned are Nelson's Bible wall pictures (see their catalogue) which are very suitable if carefully selected.

- 1 *May. Opening of the Month of May.* (Blackboard picture: The Holy Family.)

After the opening prayer, describe the home life of Our Lord. The motherly care of Mary has been extended to

all, but especially to those who love her. How does she care for us? She is not far away: she is with Our Lord. She is the Queen of the angels and she sends these angels to protect us against the evil spirits who try to tempt us. She is always talking to Our Lord about our needs.

Relate some stories about the value of devotion to Mary. Teach the children how to use ejaculations. Useful questions might be: Is Jesus Christ really God? Who is His Father? Who is His Mother? Why does Our Lady love you? How does she help us? Are there any pictures of Mary in your home? What shall we do for the month of May?

A meeting in church could then be arranged for the bestowal of the miraculous medal or some such consecration: all the better if the suggestion seems to come from the children. Close with some prayers and ejaculations and the priest's blessing. If possible, it is far better to take boys and girls separately for the meeting in church. Their mentality and rate of development are so different as to demand separate treatment even from early years. (See Pius XI under the heading: Co-education: Encycl. Christian Education.)

3rd Sunday after Easter—*The Presence of Christ in the Soul.*
(Blackboard picture: The Risen Christ.)

After the opening prayer the subject might be approached by asking: Have you noticed the Paschal candle in the Sanctuary? What is it there for? Then describe the scene in today's Gospel where Our Lord promises to come back to the Apostles. *I will see you again and your heart shall rejoice and your joy no man shall take away from you.* The Gospel might then be read aloud from a missal by one of the class. *The disciples were glad when they saw Jesus* You would be glad if you could see Him and talk with Him. The sanctuary lamp is a sign that Jesus is in the tabernacle. He is also in your heart and therefore you should always keep a joyful heart.

How could you lose Jesus? Only by a "big sin done on purpose", but you would never be so wicked as that. Whenever you feel unhappy or tempted, go and talk to Jesus in the centre of your heart. He will make

you happy again. Our Lord never wants you to be miserable.

Why is the Paschal candle put out after Holy Communion? Because He has left the altar: but He is now in the hearts of the people. Is Jesus in your home? Have you any picture of Our Lord or a crucifix in your room? Can you talk to Jesus without moving your lips?

Recommend the practice of saying a Hail Mary before sleep to ask the grace never to lose Jesus by a mortal sin. (Start tonight.) The lesson can conclude with a Hail Mary said for this intention and the priest's blessing. (At the next lesson ask the children: Did you remember to say that Hail Mary?)

22 May. *The Ascension.*

1. *Novenas.* After the opening prayers ask again about the Paschal candle. Why has it been removed? Then describe the Ascension with plenty of detail (*see Fouard*). This prepares the way for a discussion on novenas, a favourite form of prayer with good Catholics. The first novena was made by the Apostles in company with Mary and the first Catholics. Tell some stories about the striking answers to novena prayers. Have you ever made a novena? Shall we make one all together? A general discussion will follow and arrangements can be made for a class novena to affect home, school and Church. (Closing prayer and the priest's blessing.)

2. *Meaning of the Ascension.* Opening prayer. After asking one of the class to tell the story of the Ascension, the question might be proposed: Why did Christ leave this world in such a wonderful and glorious manner? The reply might be that God the Father wished to glorify His Son publicly to make up for all the insults He had received. He wanted to show men that He accepted the sacrifice made by Jesus for us (*de la Taille*). If a gift is offered publicly it is accepted publicly. (Give examples.)

Then again, Our Lord wanted to show a glimpse of Heaven to His first disciples so that their hearts would desire Heaven above all things. The first Christians went back to Jerusalem full of joy. They remembered Our Lord's words: *Go ye and teach all nations.* After the descent of the

Holy Ghost they spread the Faith all over the world. Every Catholic ought to be an apostle. Some of you, perhaps, will be priests, etc. Some of you will be called by God to marry. If so, you must marry a good Catholic and have a good Catholic home. All of you must pray and work to bring souls to Our Lord. Do you ever pray for the conversion of England and for the Pagans? (The instruction may be closed by the recital of prayers for these intentions and the priest's blessing.)

31 May. *Whitsun Eve. Baptism.* (Blackboard picture : The Baptism of Christ.)

In preparation for important liturgical events like the vigil of Pentecost it may be useful to give the appropriate lesson on the previous day in order to arouse a sense of interest in what is coming. The children will then go to church more eagerly to witness what has already been described to them.

After the preparatory prayer, tell the story of the baptism of Christ. Point to the Dove and explain that the Holy Ghost takes possession of the soul in baptism, after the priest has pronounced the exorcisms. The picture in the baptistery representing John the Baptist baptizing Our Lord shows that the Church regards this event as a foreshadowing of the sacrament.

Then follows a short account of the blessing of the font on Whitsun eve, the instruction of neophytes, etc. Baptism is necessary in order to enter Heaven ; only the children of God can enter there. You must be ready to baptize a dying child if it is impossible to get a priest in time.

Practical Demonstration of Baptism : Most Catholic children understand theoretically how to baptize : they can quote the Catechism correctly, but if they are asked to demonstrate the method practically they will probably fail. Today's instruction might well conclude with a practical demonstration of the correct method. The importance of the matter warrants meticulous care. Some of the class might be asked to baptize a doll with water from a jug, or, failing a doll, one of the smaller children might be chosen to act as subject.

A. GITS, S.J.

NOTES ON RECENT WORK

ASCETICAL AND MYSTICAL THEOLOGY

S*T. Ignatius Loyola and Prayer*¹ is a posthumous and incomplete work of Archbishop Goodier. But it is complete enough to make clear the Archbishop's interpretation of the *Spiritual Exercises*. He explains how they were a growth, "a collection of notes, gathered together, emended, rearranged for the benefit of others, but with many connecting links omitted, left for him to insert who has already learnt their use". They need such a guide because they are not an orderly, literary work; they are not meant to be read, but at every step to be set aside and put into practice.

The Archbishop does not admit that St. Ignatius was in any sense an innovator in the way of prayer. He had a certain originality, of course, as any great soul has; but the influences which formed him came from the great traditional schools of piety, Benedictine, Cistercian, Carthusian, Dominican, Franciscan, and, not least, from the Brothers of the Common Life, represented by à Kempis.

If we are to believe His Grace, the Saint was not a master of discursive prayer. While he believed in a sufficient use of the reason to get prayer going, if necessary, he did not inculcate a reasoned discourse, a thinking-out or pondering-over of spiritual truths. What he really strove to achieve in the Exercitant was the complete, all-pervading reign of one great act, affection and resolution, namely the loving of God supremely; and all he asked of the reason was the discovery of a thought which struck home and stirred the soul's sense of God and its appreciation of Him. But such use of the reason is really a contemplative act. St. Ignatius may call it "meditation". He uses the words "meditation" and "contemplation" indifferently. But it is not methodical meditation in the sense of later writers. There is really no Ignatian method, if we consult the Founder himself.

¹ Burns Oates & Washbourne. Pp. 200, 7s. 6d. The book opens with a beautiful, full-length memoir of the Archbishop, written by Fr. H. Keane, S.J., originally for *The Canadian Messenger of the Sacred Heart*.

The Archbishop insists, rightly, that the Saint was a great contemplative. Hence the purpose of the *Exercises* was to form contemplatives. Therefore His Grace sees St. Ignatius teaching contemplation right through the book, even in the first week. "The terminus of the first week," he writes, "is no more nor less than a higher form of prayer than that which the soul had when it began. It is a truly contemplative state, as contrasted with one of reasoning and examination, perhaps even of acts" (p. 92). The soul has been struck to its depths with the horror of sin. "It has come into a new world ; it has not only resolved to begin its life anew, but life itself has now a new meaning ; it has become subject to those emotions, and disturbances, and trials, of which all mystical writers speak. When this occurs, says St. Ignatius, the soul is in the 'state' required for further development and must push on. St. John of the Cross would say it has completed its 'Ascent of Mount Carmel' ; it has experienced the first horror of the 'Dark Night of the Soul' " (p. 93). Thus already at the very opening of the Illuminative Way the soul has felt the impress of God, and begun to enjoy some share of "infused" contemplation.

It seems to me that the Archbishop's book, fine and at times noble as it is, merits the same criticism as do certain parts of his treatise on Ascetical and Mystical Theology. He has rightly emphasized the point that meditation should not be too rigid ; that the Exercitant should not feel himself constrained to think out three considerations and to peg on to each a requisite number of acts and affections. He has also rightly contended that contemplation in some form is for all. But in doing these commendable things he has once again obliterated the boundaries in the domain of prayer. The Archbishop always tended to write descriptively, and from a practical standpoint. Hence he was inclined, it seems, to transfer his own states to good souls in general ; to neglect objective analysis and the clear-cut definition of terms.

It is only a speculative theologian who can write a scientific treatise on prayer, because such a treatise involves a very detailed discussion of grace, the virtues and the Gifts of the Holy Ghost. Unfortunately there is much

divergence of opinion among the theologians on certain aspects of grace, the virtues and the gifts, so that a unanimous view on the theological development of prayer is still far from achieved. But all theologians do agree that infused contemplation, such as St. John of the Cross and St. Teresa describe (though they differ in their terminology), is a high degree of prayer, demanding in the Exercitant real perfection of charity and a pronounced activity of the gifts of the Holy Ghost, particularly of Wisdom. One may add that, if there can be said to be a Jesuit school of thought with regard to mysticism, it holds a very different opinion from the Archbishop on the ease and availability of infused contemplation. Rather it tends to insist that infused contemplation is a rare gift, not intended for all, but outside the normal development of the spiritual life and granted as God wills to a select few. I am not maintaining that this view is correct, or that the Archbishop was not at liberty to accept the opposite view, that any degree or kind of contemplation is open to all souls in grace. But the presence of such a view among the sons of St. Ignatius would indicate a widespread conviction that meditation, understood not too rigidly, was taught by St. Ignatius as a means of conversion from sin and growth in virtue, and that he on the one hand and SS. John of the Cross and Teresa on the other had rather different types of soul in mind when they wrote their respective treatises.

It seems that the true growth of prayer can be most easily understood if one likens it to the growth of friendship between two human beings. Friendship begins by an awareness of compatibility. Therein is initial affection. It will only become final and full after the friends have gained much knowledge of each other by continued contacts, by a developing understanding of the value of each other's qualities, their likeness and unlikeness to each other, by thinking things out in quiet moments and comparing the friend with others. It is only gradually that the many impressions and ideas which the friend conveys and the many judgements formed of him are built up into one image which is himself. So, too, or rather even more so, with regard to God. He is such an exacting Friend. Even as incarnate, He is hidden and makes no direct human

contact with us. He asks for great surrenders, not only of sin, but also of much that is in itself harmless but tends to draw us from lofty spiritual ideals by the fibres of our human nature and sense-inspired instincts. Our God is a jealous God. To grasp the meaning of friendship with Him is not the work of a day. Only bit by bit can we acquire compatibility with Him and drive home to ourselves ideas of Him which penetrate and hold and gain the mastery over our pride and passions. Even when a soul experiences a sudden great conversion it must afterwards slowly see the full implications of its conversion. St. Paul took two years in the desert before he had thought out his new life.

Such a building-up of a simple yet rich and living idea of God is the work of discursive meditation and affective prayer. It is only at the end of the process that contemplation as a habit of soul begins. The soul may have had experience of contemplation earlier on now and then, as God wills; and thus sampled, so to say, the higher ways of love to which, if it is faithful, it will one day attain. But while it is still in the stages of purgation and illumination it must be content with something less than contemplation if it is not to aim beyond its reach and lose its time and effort. No doubt St. Ignatius had contemplation in view when he wrote the *Exercises*; but what he was actually concerned with was the cleansing of the soul from sin and the building-up in it of the Christ-life, and these are the works proper to the purgative and illuminative ways.

The Legion of Mary has become an indispensable factor in many parishes. Since its foundation in Dublin with fifteen members in 1921 it has grown phenomenally, so that now after only twenty years of life it is found in all the continents and has become one of the foremost agents of practical Catholic Action. It is, so to say, Marian Catholic Action, for all its inspiration comes from Mary. The last literary work of the late Cecily Hallack was a description of the work and growth of the Legion.¹ It is a spirited narrative, very full for its compass, and delightfully readable. Every Legionary will treasure the book; and many others will be drawn to the Legion by reading it.

¹*The Legion of Mary*, by Cecily Hallack. (Frederick Muller. Pp. 192. 5s.)

Our Guiding Star, by Father Vernon Johnson,¹ is a simple life of the Little Flower to make her known to everyone. The author's purpose is by popularizing her story to popularize her Little Way and thus lead more souls to live by the central truths of the Faith. Fr. Johnson's is one of the most charming lives of the Saint yet written.

Saint Mary Magdalen, by Fr. Vincent McNabb, O.P.,² gives us the life of the Saint from the Gospels, interpreted according to Western tradition, in separate sections, dealing with the Crucifixion, the Anointing, the Household at Bethany, and the Resurrection. In each section, after the Narrative, Fr. McNabb lets his mind roam over the incident in a series of staccato notes, which succeed in giving us a vivid impression of the greatest Mary after our Lady, and at the same time furnish many a useful thought for our meditation and practice.

The Meaning of the Mass, by Rev. John Kearney, C.S.Sp.,³ is a third and enlarged edition of an already deservedly popular book. It contains materials for meditation on the Holy Sacrifice and its relation to the spiritual life. It explains admirably the doctrine of the Sacrifice of the Mass; and, in this latest edition, sets out the meaning of the prayers of the Mass. This is a really helpful book.

Keep Thou My Soul, by Rev. E. C. Messenger, Ph.D.,⁴ explains itself by its sub-title: "The Liturgy in Life and Death, Peace and War". It is a book of simple, prayerful considerations on the Mass in Time of War, the Mass for Peace, the Mass for a Good Death, and the Mass for the Dead. Dr. Messenger gives, where possible, the historical background against which these Masses grew up, and explains the proper in each case. It is a very timely book. Those who use it will find much consolation and encouragement in our present anxieties and dangers. They will see in it the Church herself showing them how to face trial and how to turn sorrow and tragedy to spiritual profit.

J. CARTMELL.

¹ Burns Oates & Washbourne Ltd. Pp. x + 100. 3s. 6d. Dr. Towers of Ushaw contributes an Introduction.

² Burns Oates & Washbourne Ltd. Pp. ix + 70. 3s. 6d.

³ Burns Oates & Washbourne Ltd. Pp. xi + 262. 6s.

⁴ Sands & Co. Ltd. Pp. 143. 5s.

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

NATIONAL FLAG IN THE SANCTUARY

Are there any regulations on the subject of placing the national flag permanently in the sanctuary of a Catholic church in this country during time of war? (J.)

REPLY

(i) Up to a few years ago the instructions of the Holy See permitted in churches only religious flags, and in the event of the emblems of anti-Catholic societies being introduced priests were directed to discontinue the function and withdraw.¹ The latter instruction is clearly much more than a positive law and is still in force, but the former has become considerably relaxed. In a reply sent to the United States Apostolic Delegate, 31 March, 1911,² the Holy Office decided that the national flag could be permitted during religious ceremonies and on the occasion of funerals, provided the church and the sacred liturgy suffered no disrespect. A similar reply from S. R. C., 26 March, 1924, n. 4390, stressed the obligation, already contained in Canon 1233, §2, of excluding flags belonging to forbidden societies or containing anti-religious emblems, but permitted the introduction of those which were unobjectionable. In both of these instructions the Holy See had in mind the occasional presence of a flag during some ecclesiastical function at which it was considered appropriate, and it was under this aspect that the matter was discussed in this REVIEW, 1934, vii, p. 347.

(ii) But further considerations arise when it is proposed, for the duration of the war, to have the national flag on the sanctuary at all times and not merely on some special occasion. It might be difficult to remove it without giving offence; a precedent once established would tend to be repeated at all future times of national emergency, and it might happen that Catholics would not then find themselves

¹ S.R.C. 14 July, 1887, n. 3679.

² *Ecclesiastical Review*, 1918, lix. p. 627.

so completely in harmony with the national cause as they are at present ; it gives an appearance of nationalism to the Church which must be of its nature supranational. All these appear to us to be very good reasons for not starting the practice, even at the present time when the national cause is so evidently in accordance with Christian principle.

It is true that some French churches are accustomed to exhibit the tricolour—not a pleasing practice in our opinion—though the Sacred Heart emblem upon it is held, no doubt, to be sufficient justification. In America, during the last war, the custom was apparently tolerated. It was held to be quite unobjectionable in time of war, and that harm would be done by refusing : there was no principle involved and it was consonant with Catholic teaching to combine patriotism with religion.¹ Certainly, there is no clear law forbidding it, and recent replies of the Holy See could be held to cover the situation.

Since, so far as we know, the practice has never existed in the Catholic churches of this country and is liable to cause some embarrassment for the reasons explained, we think that the proper answer to the above question is that the national flag should not appear habitually in our churches unless authorized by the Ordinary.

E. J. M.

DIVORCE AND MARRIAGE CONSENT

To what extent is the validity of marriage affected in the case of non-Catholics whose religious convictions may be quite definite that the divorce of a Christian marriage is permitted from Matthew xix, 9? (E. W.)

REPLY

A full discussion of the subject may be seen in this REVIEW, 1931, Vol. I, p. 27. From Canon 1084 it is clear that a simple error concerning one of the essential properties of marriage does not invalidate the consent, even when the contract would never have been made except for this

¹ *Ecclesiastical Review*, 1918, lix. p. 421.

error; i.e. even in the case of a Protestant who feels so strongly, and even religiously, on the subject that he would under no circumstances marry except for this conviction that the marriage can, in certain contingencies, be dissolved. Inasmuch as the consent at the moment of making the contract effects the marriage sacrament—*matrimonium facit consensus*—the Church considers only what a man intended to do at that moment. For the consent to be judged invalid by an ecclesiastical court the evidence offered must prove that at the time the contract was made there was a positive act of the will excluding its indissolubility. This defect is, indeed, more easily proved if it can be shown to exist from the words of the marriage rite, or from a previous agreement entered upon by the parties, or even by an express condition made only by one party; but a positive act of the will excluding this essential property of marriage alone suffices, though it is difficult to prove.

The law is well stated in a Rota judgment¹: “Cum simplex error circa matrimoni indissolubilitatem, etsi dat causam contractui, consensum matrimoniale non vitiet, valide matrimonium contrahunt, nisi aliud obsit, protestantes alique qui falso putant matrimonii vinculum solvi posse. Praevalet scilicet generalis voluntas de matrimonio iuxta divinam institutionem ineundo, eaque privatum illum errorem quodammodo absorbet. . . . Si vero alterutra vel utraque pars positivo voluntatis actu excludat matrimonii indissolubilitatem, invalide contrahit. Cum enim vel unus e contrahentibus intentionem habeat huiusmodi: ‘volo contrahere matrimonium, sed nolo tradere alteri parti ius perpetuum’, positivo voluntatis actu indissolubilitatem, quae est ex essentialibus proprietatibus matrimonii, excludens, ipse positive vult matrimonium, et simul positive non vult, ita ut duo contrarii positivi actus mutuo se elidant, vel posterior, utpote specificus, priorem destruat”.

Accordingly, the answer to the above question, as it stands, is that the validity of the contract is not affected by a non-Catholic's religious beliefs. The point to be examined is whether these errors positively affected the consent at the time it was made.

E. J. M.

¹ S. R. Rotae Decisiones, XVI, 1923, p. 64; coram Maximo Massimi.

TABERNACLE KEY

The penultimate paragraph of the document printed, January 1941, p. 89, seems to modify the official instruction by applying to the tabernacle key what the instruction applies to the safe key. In churches where there are several assistant priests, is the law properly observed by keeping the key of the safe (which contains the tabernacle key) within the presbytery in a secret place known only to the clergy? (L.)

REPLY

S. C. De Disciplina Sacramentorum, 26 May, 1938, n. 6, c :
 “. . . clavis vel ab ecclesiae rectore domi custodiatur aut ab ipso continenter gestetur, amissionis periculo remoto, vel in sacrario, et quidem in loco tuto et secreto, reponatur altera clavi claudenda, quam alteram clavem uti supra rector tueatur.”

22 August, 1940, N. 4741/39 : “. . . clavis tabernaculi extra horas sacrarum functionum non servetur in sacristia, sed apud ipsum parochum. Non solum tabernaculum, sed etiam sacristiae armarium, sit arca ferrea securitatis (safe).”

The private reply given on the occasion of the sacrilege in Ireland improves upon the previous public instruction by requiring the sacristy to have a safe, but the point appears to be irrelevant, so far as the tabernacle key is concerned, since in this particular case it is directed that the tabernacle key is to be kept not in the sacristy but “apud ipsum parochum”; obviously this direction is for the particular instance mentioned, since it specifically selects one out of the three methods contained in the public instruction.

The three alternative directions given are : (a) to keep the tabernacle key in the rector's house ; (b) to keep it on his person ; (c) to keep it in a secure and secret place under lock and key in the sacristy, the key of this place being either as in (a) or (b). The law is, therefore, accurately observed in the method suggested by our correspondent, which has everything to recommend it as being the only

practical way of giving a number of priests access to the key of the tabernacle. The practice of hiding the key of the sacristy safe somewhere in the sacristy does not observe the law.

E. J. M.

REPRISALS

You give a statement of His Majesty's Government, 18 May, 1940 (CLERGY REVIEW, December 1940, p. 478), which makes it clear that it is no part of our policy to bomb non-military objectives, no matter what the policy of the German Government may be. Are there any more recent official declarations of this kind? (P. R.)

REPLY

(i) *The Times*, 9 October, 1940, reported a statement on the subject by Mr. Churchill in Parliament, in the course of which he said: "What we are doing now is to batter continuously, with forces which steadily increase in power, each one of those points in Germany the destruction of which we believe will do the Germans most injury and will most speedily lessen their power to strike at us. Is that a reprisal? It seems to me very like one. At any rate it is all we have time for now. We should be foolish now to shift off those military targets, which the skill of our navigators enables us to find with a very great measure of success, to any other targets at the present stage." This is in agreement with the earlier statement in so far as it is an expression of what the Government is *de facto* ordering. It is inconclusive, perhaps, from an ethical point of view, since it seems to contemplate the bombardment of non-military objectives at some future time, should this action be necessary. On the other hand, it must be noted that the Prime Minister was not concerned with the definition of reprisals when he made this statement—in his view it was a sterile controversy. It suffices for our own guidance to know that, for military reasons alone, the bombardment of non-military objectives is not the present policy of the Government. "Do not let us," he continued, "get into a

sterile controversy on the question of what are and what are not reprisals. Our object must be to inflict the maximum harm on the war-making capacity of the enemy."

(ii) On the occasion of the R.A.F. attack upon Munich-Sir Archibald Sinclair, the Air Minister, stated in an interview with a *Daily Express* reporter, 11 November, 1940, that it was the intention of the R.A.F. to hit the German armed forces and their sources of supply as hard as possible and to go on hitting them. It will be remembered that a bomb fell on the Munich beer-hall where Hitler was due to speak, and it cannot be denied, we suppose, that the Führer is a military objective. "Certainly," the Minister said, "it has been, and it will remain, true that we concentrate our bombing resources on those objectives which will weaken Germany's power to continue the war."

(iii) As reported in *The Times*, 15 January, 1941, Mr. Ramsbotham, President of the Board of Education, commenting upon the destruction of schools in Birmingham, gave three reasons why we should not carry out bombing attacks on German schools as reprisals. His third reason is, perhaps, of debatable value: "Nazi education is so debasing the German character and blunting the intelligence of the German youth that in our own interest it would be a pity to interfere with the continuance of that process." But the other two reasons given were exactly what we conceive to be the true ethical grounds for not bombing schools: it would be reducing civilized people to quasi-savages, and schools are not military objectives.

E. J. M.

O SALUTARIS

Is it strictly of obligation to sing this hymn always at the beginning of Benediction? If so, should the incensation be delayed until the first verse is finished? (S.)

REPLY

I Conc. Prov. West. Decretum xviii, 4: In expositione et Benedictione exacte servetur ritus jam ab episcopis approbatus et typis impressus. . . .

Ritus Servandus, Praemonenda : Quo vero accuratius novus haec omnia Ritus exprimeret, placuit eum, antequam typis exscriberetur, S. Rituum Congregationis Consultori exhibere, qui eiusdem Congregationis viris rei liturgicae componendae delectis a Secretis est. Porro sancitus est a Sacra Rituum Congregatione.

Ibid. p. 14 n. 6 : Consuetudo omnino servanda est quae apud nos invaluit cantandi hymnum *O Salutaris Hostia* in ipso momento SS. Sacramenti solemniter exponendi.

(i) The doubt arises from the fact that there is no common law prescribing this hymn to be sung, and it is not the usual practice in Rome. Nevertheless, since the details concerning what shall be sung or said are left to the local Ordinary to determine, it is quite certain, from the above quotations, that in all dioceses where the use of the *Ritus Servandus* is of obligation the *O Salutaris* must be sung whilst the Blessed Sacrament is being exposed.

(ii) The second doubt is probably due to the rule which prescribes the second incensation to take place "ad initium sequentis strophae *Genitori Genitoque* . . ." There is no similar direction for the second verse of the *O Salutaris*. On the contrary, the rubric n. 6 states that the first incensation should take place immediately after the Blessed Sacrament is exposed ; it is, therefore, correct to perform the incensation without any reference to the stage reached in the singing of the hymn.

E. J. M.

ORIGINS OF BENEDICTION ¹

What proof is there that the origin of Benediction is to be sought in the practice of devout people during the Middle Ages, who were accustomed to sing at Our Lady's statue on Sunday evenings and afterwards to visit the Blessed Sacrament? May it be held that the coalescing of these two practices has resulted in our rite of Benediction? Is it of obligation to sing the Litany of Our Lady or some other anthem in her honour at the present day? (C.)

¹ It is hoped that an article will shortly be published on this subject.—
EDITOR.

REPLY

There is some dispute about the origins of Benediction, many putting the stress on the evening devotions to Our Lady, others holding that Exposition and Benediction were already in possession. It is agreed that the two have coalesced.

(i) Fr. Thurston, S.J., following the conclusions of the Bollandist De Buck, dealt with the question in the *Month*, 1901, p. 587 of Vol. 97, and pp. 58, 186, 264 of Vol. 98. It was the subject of an interesting paper read by him at the London *Eucharistic Congress*, 1908, and printed in the *Report of the Congress*, p. 452. Later, in the *Month*, 1916, Vol. 128, p. 300, during the course of an historical study of the *Salve Regina*, his conclusions were again summarized: "The main interest of this *Salve Regina* service, already several years ago discussed in these pages, is the fact that it has undoubtedly given us the evening Benediction of the Blessed Sacrament which is so familiar at the present day." Examples of this development are cited, particularly in Belgium and France, and the common French name for this service, "salut", is itself a strong argument for connecting Benediction with the *Salve*. Another link with the past is the custom still existing in some colleges of singing Our Lady's antiphon before Benediction on Saturday evening, a practice brought from abroad when the colleges returned to England at the end of the eighteenth century. This explanation of the origin of Benediction is adopted by many, e.g. Canon Van de Velde in *Questions Liturgiques et Paroissiales*, 1925, p. 289, and it is the usual one found in the text-books, e.g. Lefèbvre, *Catholic Liturgy*, p. 74.

(ii) More recent writers, however, are inclined to seek the origin of the rite in specifically Eucharistic devotions, and in the course of two interesting and well-documented articles on *The Development of Devotion to the Blessed Sacrament*, contributed by Fr. J. Murphy, S.J., to this REVIEW, 1936, Vol. XI, this opinion is reckoned to be more probably correct: "Others say that although these Marian devotions were the universal practice, the addition of a blessing with the Blessed Sacrament was the custom only where ex-

position during the Office closing with Benediction was already in practice. . . . Since Benediction is specifically a Eucharistic service, such a view seems the more probable." Fr. P. Browe, S.J., seems to have been the first to expound this theory, in *Die Verehrung der Eucharistie im Mittelalter*, Munich, 1933, and in some earlier contributions to periodical literature, notably in *Der Segen mit Reliquien der Patene und Eucharistie, Ephemerides Liturgicae*, 1931, p. 383. He shows that the mediaeval custom of blessing the faithful with relics, for example, on the occasion of a procession, was imitated, when the feast and procession of Corpus Christi were introduced, by blessing them with the sacred Host; when expositions took place on days other than Corpus Christi the same custom of blessing the people continued; there are several examples of this practice in France, Spain and Italy during the sixteenth century, and in Germany as early as the fourteenth. The practice of exposition was itself prepared by the popular desire to look upon the Host, and by the many prayers expressly composed for use whilst so doing. In fact, the elevation of the Host at Mass is due to this popular demand rather than, as used to be thought, to ecclesiastical authority, which was supposed to have ordered the rite as a protest against the heresy of Berengarius.

(iii) A writer in *Ephemerides Liturgicae*, 1927, p. 125, mentions the view, held by some liturgists, that the rite of Benediction was, perhaps, introduced by St. Antony Maria Zaccaria. He certainly introduced the XL Hours' Exposition at Vicenza, as recorded in *Lectio vi* of his Office, 5 July, but Benediction existed long before his time. The truth seems to be that it was a popular and spontaneous growth in various parts of Europe, deriving its essential characteristics from the Corpus Christi rites. In those places, especially in France, where the custom of evening devotions or stations in honour of Our Lady existed, the rite of exposition and benediction became detached from the Mass and attached to the hour when Marial devotions took place. A good summary of the whole question may be seen in two contributions by Dr. Dumoutet in *Revue Apologétique*, 1931, Vol. LII, pp. 409 and 529. Unfortunately, owing to the war, one has not

been able to consult recent fascicules of Cabrol's *Dictionnaire d'Archéologie* : there will, no doubt, be a fresh examination of the subject s.v. "Salut".

(iv) Except for the portion of the rite from *Tantum Ergo* to the prayer *Deus Qui* no very explicit directions exist in the common law as to what may or may not be sung during this rite. The Roman custom is for the priest to expose the Blessed Sacrament and to reappear vested in a Cope at the *Tantum Ergo*, the period of exposition being used for any authorized popular chants or devotions. There is certainly nothing in the common law requiring a litany or anthem of Our Lady always to be sung or recited, though the practice is extremely fitting for traditional reasons. Our English *Ritus Servandus* similarly contains no direction in this sense, but local Ordinaries sometimes require a prayer or Anthem in honour of Our Lady on Sundays and Holidays, as in the *Statuta* of Middlesborough (1933), n. 195.

E. J. M.

CHURCH MANAGEMENT

THE ALTAR OF REPOSE

THE observance of the Altar of Repose, as now followed everywhere in the Latin Church, originated with the Council of Trent. It is a liturgical curiosity in that it is a revival of the more ancient manner of reserving the Blessed Sacrament combined with the ceremonial and devotion which were proper to the discontinued rite of the Easter Sepulchre. The mediaeval custom is commemorated by the term sepulchre which, with the sanction of the S.R.C., we still apply to the Altar of Repose.

The rite of the Easter Sepulchre was not, as many imagine, peculiar to Sarum: it was common throughout northern Europe, and in at least one diocese it continued until late in the seventeenth century. There were, of course, many local variations. Four types of sepulchre were used in England: an arched recess in the north wall of the chancel; a sepulchre altar constructed with a simple hollow; an altar tomb of a benefactor, usually occupying the place of honour beneath the arch on the north side of the chancel; in cathedrals and large churches, a grand architectural structure resembling a chantry chapel.

After the Maundy Mass the cross from the high altar and the sacred Host were placed in a gabled wooden coffer and solemnly borne in procession to the sepulchre, there to remain until Eastern morning. Watching was continuous. In later developments unliturgical features were added, such as young men dressed as soldiers and angels who gave dramatic displays. The Roman liturgy, always dignified and restrained, lost nothing by the discontinuance of the ceremonies of the Easter Sepulchre.

The Altar of Repose must be prepared in a place apart from the high altar; it need not be an altar in the strict sense of the word; a table will serve, and a stone is not required. A side chapel, or side altar, is the most convenient place, but where one does not exist, any suitable position in the church may be chosen. A single altar cloth is sufficient, but a white frontal should be used.

The *Caeremoniale Episcoporum*¹ allows a discreet use

¹ Lib., I, c. xii, n. 12.

of flowers for great feasts, but for the Altar of Repose flowers are expressly prescribed, a unique instance, by the *Memoriale Rituum*.¹ There should also be a profusion of candles. It is strictly forbidden to add reliquaries, pictures, or statues of Our Lady, St. John, Mary Magdalen, Angels and soldiers. Bishops may tolerate such representations in places where they have been customary from very ancient times.

In a church which has no side altars a spare porch, if there be one, can very fittingly be draped for use as the Altar of Repose. Another practical solution is to screen off a space in the body of the church by means of hangings draped after the manner of dossal and riddels; this can be done gracefully but inexpensively with battens and curtain material.

When the Altar of Repose is in a side chapel the tabernacle is commonly used for the reservation: this is permitted, provided that the tabernacle be covered correctly with a veil, but it is more in keeping with tradition and the Ritual to have an urn (*urna, capsula*) which should rest upon the table. There are no directions as to the material from which the urn should be made, nor as to the shape. The simplest and most serviceable is a wooden coffer fashioned like an ark or a turret; it should be gilded outside, and within also unless lined with silk. A strong lock should be fitted. It is important that the urn should be spacious enough to allow a corporal to be spread on the floor, and to take an upstanding chalice and also, should there be no other place for the purpose, the ciborium.

Night-watching is always a perplexing problem. It is not advisable to keep the night watch unless one can be certain of having at least three men at a time. If there are only two it may happen that one is taken ill or fails to appear. Where there is a staff of more than one priest, one should stay up all night to supervise. Some of us have had experience of irregularities, as, for instance, when with no thought of irreverence, the watchers have left the church and spent most of the time smoking and chatting in the sacristy. Some of us may have come down in the morning to find the church empty, the watchers having departed,

¹ Tit., IV, c. i, § 4, n. 1.

leaving the candles burning, through the failure of those who were to relieve them. If in a single-handed parish the priest himself cannot stay up all night, he should try to arrange for the good services of a willing and reliable parishioner. On the whole, it is not difficult to find sufficient watchers, whether the parish be large or small. But, on the other hand, should one expect men who have to work hard all the week to give up a full night's rest out of a much needed holiday?

J. P. R.

BOOK REVIEWS

Ireland in the Age of Reform and Revolution. By Nicholas Mansergh, B. Litt., M.A., D. Phil. Demy 8vo. Pp. 272. (George Allen & Unwin. 10s. 6d.)

THIS is an interesting, well-written and honest book; slight perhaps for its price, and narrower in scope than its title suggests. It is not a history of Ireland at all, but what the author describes in the sub-title as a "commentary on Anglo-Irish relations and on political forces in Ireland" from 1840 to 1921. Dr. Mansergh divides his work into three parts, which most readers will find to grow progressively in interest. Part One, perhaps the most original, is an account of the state of Ireland and the Irish Question as seen by continental observers: de Beaumont, Cavour, Mazzini, Marx, Engels and Lenin. On the whole they give little proof of acute or accurate perception, and give force to the contention that most people see the affairs of other countries in function of their own preconceptions. In particular Dr. Mansergh emphasizes the fact that the Irish Question is a direct refutation of the Marxist interpretation of History. Part Two discusses the English approach to the problem, from Gladstone to Asquith. The last chapter of this section, "The Ulster Question, 1886-1938," is a notable piece of balanced historical writing, the more damning in its censure of the Unionist subverters and the Orange bloc

in that it is free from both bias and animosity. It is the third part of the book, "The Character of the Irish Revolt", which is the most interesting and will probably provoke most discussion. While insisting on the importance of economic considerations, Dr. Mansergh sees the problem in function of politics and nationalism, though oddly enough he never uses the word "sovereignty". Many will feel that he gives too little weight to the religious influence, and his criticism of the lack of Irish contribution to the philosophy of nationalism is perhaps premature. Yet on the whole this is a discerning essay in political analysis which deserves to be read on both sides of the Irish Sea ; and Dr. Mansergh has been wise enough not to venture into the paths of prophecy.¹

A. B.

The Christ at Chartres. By Denis Saurat. Pp. x + 46. (Dent. 4s.)

"*Ce qui n'est pas clair n'est pas français.*" Perhaps ; but as a translator of modern French philosophy once said to me : "Once a Frenchman has made up his mind to be nebulous, not even a German can beat him at it."

M. Saurat has certainly made up his mind to be nebulous—encouraged, one imagines, by the example of Victor Hugo, of whose steamier thought (*Bouche d' Ombre* and the like) he is known to be an exponent. The thesis of his book is that there exists in France "a vision of the Gallic spirit, older than historical Christianity, wider than the following of the Catholic Church ; a wild vision alive still among the peasants of France, from Brittany to Alsace, from Flanders to the Pyrenees, first discerned perhaps in the caves of the Dordogne fifty thousand years ago, as we count time, and then perhaps taught by the Druids to the stone-masons of the Middle Ages, and still lambent through the land". Having paused to savour the word "lambent", one proceeds to ask what the vision is, and this is a little hard to explain. The following articles of belief dimly emerge : Christ is

¹ There are a few careless slips in proof-reading ; notably the author's own initials (p. 14), the date of the English edition of some of Marx's letters (p. 63), and the date of Wyndham's Land Act (p. 85).

Creator ; the Crucifixion is the Creation ; the time of the Creation is the moment of Christ's conception ; there is telepathy ; there is reincarnation ; Patripassianists and Pelagians are right. Evidence for this vision or these beliefs comes from various sources : the sculpture at Chartres of Christ as Creator ; an aged Canon, "a theologian", who says among other things : "One can only love truly a God whom one does not know for sure to exist" ; a high official who has Rider Haggardish experiences and lurches into metaphysics with the pronouncement : "The fragments of the One must be the Many" ; an anti-clerical peasant who wakes up one night shouting an act of faith while at the same time he has a telepathic vision of an attempted suicide ; a Frenchman domiciled in England who projects the anger in his heart into the visible form of "a small man about the size of a human fist, nearly naked, yet harnessed with a precise panoply of war, like a huge insect surrounded by tentacles"—an apparition which he afterwards re-absorbs.

In presenting these esoteric notions as an alternative to orthodox Christianity, M. Saurat has made the fatal mistake of allowing them to revolve round a unique historical Christ ("Time begins nine months B.C."). It would have been safer to parade a whole host of saviour-gods (Osiris, Odin, etc.) in the well-known manner of anthropologists. As it is, his doctrine of Christ at once invites a comparison with Christian doctrine, of which he is rather too obviously ignorant. There is nothing novel to Christians in the idea of Christ as Creator ; *creare est commune toti Trinitati*, and according to Émile Mâle such representation as that at Chartres is the rule and not the exception in mediaeval art. Patripassianism belongs to a quite different order of beliefs. The conceptions of time and timelessness with which M. Saurat toys so uneasily have been profoundly explored in traditional Christian thought, and even he should be aware of the great phrase of the Apocalypse, *occisus ab origine mundi*. As for telepathy and reincarnation and disappearing manikins—whatever their scientific or philosophic interest, they seem equally beyond the author's control, and his final medley has neither depth nor coherence.

W. S.

Middle English Sermons. Edited by Woodburn O. ROSS.

Pp. lxvi + 396. (Oxford University Press. 30s.)

Captive Flames. By Mgr. Ronald Knox. Pp. 150. (Burns Oates. 5s.)

Were You Listening? By the Rev. John C. Heenan, D.D. Pp. 60. (Sands. 2s.)

IN these three volumes of discourses there is matter not only for many a Sunday sermon but also for an interesting study in comparisons and contrasts. To most of us the first point is the important one, since our preaching is ever before us, but the second is deserving of our attention, though it will call up visions and dreams of leisure to be quickly crowded out by the pressure of immediate parochial duties. However busy a priest may be he should always leave a margin of time for private devotions, apart from Holy Mass and the Breviary; and similarly he should earmark a short period of each day solely for cultural study. Anyone who cares to take for his subject "Sermons Medieval and Modern" will find sufficient material in these three books to make delightful reading for many a day.

Middle English Sermons is edited from a British Museum MS. The price may seem to be high for a book of normal size, but when one considers the amount of work that has been necessary for its publication (it is an Early English Text Society volume) 30s. appears a moderate sum. To draw a homely parallel, this book costs 400 cigarettes. In addition to its fifty-one sermons, it contains an excellent glossary, copious elucidating notes and references, and a rare display of documentation. The sermons themselves, as the title indicates, are in Middle English of the late fourteenth and early fifteenth centuries, but they are so clearly printed as to be readily readable. The preacher's subjects are principally what the subjects of our own sermons should be, namely, the eternal truths of the Faith applied to the problems of the day. It warms one's heart whilst studying these sermons to be reminded in every paragraph of the identity of our Faith with that of our countrymen 600 years ago, and so frequently to find in use such well-worn quotations as, for instance, St. Jerome's "Death by Eve: Life by Mary".

The twenty-one panegyrics preached by Mgr. Knox on

various occasions during a score of years are, as one would expect, carefully prepared sermons with numerous references and illustrations, every discourse being marked by that touch of practical simplicity which can be given only by a master in the craft of address. St. Edward, St. George, St. Joan, Henry the Sixth, St. Bernadette and G. K. Chesterton are among the company here assembled. Each is held up for individual virtue and personal example, and all mirror forth the same glorious heritage of our common Catholic Faith. No one who regularly—or for that matter rarely—buys a Catholic book should fail to get this one; it will be pronounced “delightful” by every reader.

In Dr. Heenan the Church in this country has a new and able exponent of her doctrines, and one whose reputation as a broadcast speaker is already firmly established. In these five talks, to the general British public and to the United States, we have a set of model discourses upon the Church’s attitude to the war, and upon the attitude of the world to the Church and its Founder. Speech that is so simple and clear, yet so utterly uncompromising in its Catholicity, must prove of untold benefit to thousands of our fellow men in such difficult and puzzling days as we are living through at present.

The discourses published in these three books are widely different in many ways and strikingly similar in others. The *Middle English Sermons* are mostly upon moral subjects, meant to move the heart as well as to instruct. They abound with anecdotes, some of which would be considered crude, judged by even the blatant standards that now obtain, but all of them are strikingly “ad rem”. The sermons of Mgr. Knox and Dr. Heenan are also largely moral exhortations, but their language is more restrained, and they appeal rather to the intellect than to the heart. One thing there is in common for all these addresses: it is the simplicity of the plan upon which they are constructed, a fact which in no mean measure accounts for their undoubted effectiveness.

L. T. H.

- (i) *Christ in the Catechism* ; (ii) *A Doctrine Diary for the Young Worker*. By Rev. J. Bradley. Pp. 32, 6d., and pp. 29, 1s. (Lonsdale & Bartholomew, Bradford.)

THE author in these booklets has done for the priest teaching in school what he did in his previous work, *The Way of Truth to Life*, for the preacher in the pulpit—namely, he has provided notes and ideas which can be developed according to one's taste and inclination.

Christ in the Catechism is an outline or syllabus of instruction for all the standards in the elementary school. It includes the scheme of graduated instruction on the Holy Eucharist approved by the English bishops in 1911, a very necessary development in accordance with the decree *Quam Singulari*, since under the Pían reform the children make their First Communion at an age when the fuller instruction, which used previously to be given to a First Communion Class, is no longer possible. The booklet contains, in addition to a suggested syllabus for each class, a number of notes for the teacher's use, all rather loosely and inconsequently arranged.

The second booklet is an amplification of the work proposed for Standard VII, a leavers' course containing, amongst other suggestions, a summary of the social teaching of the Church. The liturgical interest is kept well to the fore, and there are some apt quotations from Bishop Hedley, but the author has not given us any discernible plan or scheme, which is an advantage, perhaps, considering the immediate purpose of the notes.

Both are published privately by the author and are therefore lacking in the qualities which a work produced by an experienced publisher would naturally possess, such as the suitable type and general "lay-out" which we usually take for granted in a printed book. They contain, nevertheless, many ideas which will be useful for the clergy who are accustomed to visit the schools regularly, in order to take chosen groups of children and supplement the work of the teachers.

E. J. M.

CORRESPONDENCE

DEANERY CONFERENCES

"Velox" writes :

I have read Dr. Hanrahan's article on Conferences in the CLERGY REVIEW with interest.

One thing that is wrong with conferences is that the cases are too long for interesting discussion. Two or three questions are asked on bookwork ; there is no effort to give a concise answer ; chunks of a text book are copied out and read out, often evidently without having been digested. The result is that by the time two or three have read answers interest has disappeared. Then the case is solved without a reasonable application of the principles hidden in those answers.

What I suggest is : Set a case and ask two questions : (a) On what principles is this case to be solved ? (b) Will you solve it ? That would ensure a real study of the tract concerned ; intelligence would be used in getting at the principles and in applying them.

With regard to an official solution, Liverpool Synod, 1899, says : "The object of a conference is not so much to enable the clergy to bring away from it a definite solution of a knotty point of theology as to secure a thorough revision of the principles underlying the case." But if a solution is going to be given, the solver must first read the decisions of conferences and face arguments or points that have been brought up in the discussions ; otherwise he will not impress or convince.

Dr. Hanrahan mentions Benedict XIV in his article ; in his *Institutio* cii, v, he says that the Penitentiary must have the answers in good time, "*ut illa commode perlegere et examinare queat, antequam sententias suas exarare ac typis evulgare debeat*".

TOWARDS PERFECT CHARITY

Fr. Lattey, S.J., writes :

It is a service to the Church in England that the CLERGY REVIEW takes in ascetical and mystical theology within

its purview. I venture to offer it, therefore, a suggestion for an intermediate act, which may perhaps help souls in their advance towards the complete surrender of themselves to God in perfect love ; a bridge, if I may so put it, between the act which is suitable even for the worst of sinners, and the act which expresses supreme perfection.

On the one side we have the excellent act of contrition to be found in our English catechism. It comprises all the proper dispositions in a business-like way : the sorrow, the desire for pardon, the detestation of sin, the three motives for contrition in the proper *crescendo*, the purpose of amendment, and of avoiding dangerous occasions. It is an act of contrition for sin as such, and some of its implications rather imply mortal sin ; still, not so distinctly as to make it unsuitable for such as have no mortal sin upon their conscience. This is given here first for reference.

At the other extreme (so to speak) is the *Sume et Suscipe* of St. Ignatius, here given last. It is reproduced from the translation of the Spanish text edited by myself and published by Herder, a translation made as literally as possible by a competent translator, assisted by some competent critics. There is no thought in it of sin, which has been amply treated in the earlier parts of the Spiritual Exercises. This is the end and the crown of all, an offering of oneself made utterly without reserve. Some other equivalent expression of this offering may be preferred.

Is there not room for something intermediate between these two acts ? It is difficult to find a perfectly suitable name for it, and that here given ("Submission") is not quite satisfactory. But the points contained in it may prove useful to those who are trying earnestly to advance in the spiritual life. No great emphasis is laid upon deliberate sins, which are sufficiently covered by the first act. Even deliberate sins which are only venial should not greatly trouble those for whom the act is written, and if by any misfortune they should be committed they will perhaps best be treated to the stronger medicine of the first act. Indeliberate sins no one can hope to avoid altogether : "If we say that we have not sin, we deceive ourselves, and the truth is not in us" (1 John i, 8). Nevertheless, the struggle against them must be vigorous, in order that they

may be fewer and less blameworthy, and indeed for fear that they should grow upon him who neglects them.

But for solid progress in the spiritual life sorrow should go far beyond this, and should cover mere imperfections, and all failure to follow to the utmost all God's holy inspirations. The reference to a rule of life is meant to cover the rule or rules of a religious, and may be altered so as to bear that meaning more explicitly; but practically all serious effort after spiritual progress is much helped by some sort of a rule of life, to which every reasonable effort should be made to be loyal. The rest of the act is devoted to a good resolution and a prayer.

What has been written above must of course be understood in a sensible way. It must not be supposed for a moment that these acts comprise every aspect or all the essentials of the spiritual life; they set forth the right dispositions, to regret all that should be regretted and desire all that should be desired, but they do not indicate in detail what is to be regretted or desired. They do not, for instance, contain catalogues of perfections and imperfections, or the articles of the creed. Again, suitable acts are to be desired for their own sakes, but only in so far as they are truly felt in the soul (or in so far as there is a true desire to feel them), and in so far as they tend (as they must do, if truly felt) to produce a permanent state of soul corresponding to the acts. Of itself the mere recitation of a formula is of no avail. But it is unnecessary to insist further upon such obvious truths.

I. CONTRITION

O my God, I am sorry and beg pardon for all my sins, and detest them above all things, because they deserve Thy dreadful punishments, because they have crucified my loving Saviour Jesus Christ, and most of all because they offend Thine infinite Goodness; and I firmly resolve, by the help of Thy grace, never to offend Thee again, and carefully to avoid the occasions of sin.

II. SUBMISSION

O my God, I am sorry, not only for all the deliberate sins which I have ever committed, whether mortal or

venial, but also for all my indeliberate sins, in which there has been even the least offence of Thine infinite Majesty and Goodness. Moreover I am sorry for all the imperfections of which I have ever been guilty, especially in being unfaithful to my rule of life, even if there has been in them no guilt of sin : further, for all neglect of Thy holy inspirations, and for all slowness or cowardice in following them. Do Thou strengthen my resolve to follow quickly and generously all the promptings of Thy holy grace. May my thoughts and desires be wholly Thine, so that Thy Divine Will may be perfectly fulfilled in me.

III. OBLATION

Take, Lord, and receive all my liberty, my memory, my understanding and all my will, all that I have and possess : you gave it me, to you, Lord, I return it : all is yours, dispose of it according to all your will : give me your love and grace, which is enough for me.

These three acts appear to correspond in a general way to the purgative, illuminative and unitive ways respectively.

EXCHANGE OF PERIODICALS

It would be a convenience in the present circumstances if the managements of periodicals accustomed to exchange copies with the CLERGY REVIEW would address them direct to the Editor at St. Edmund's College, Old Hall, Ware, Herts.

PERMISSU SUPERIORUM

re
ty
cc-
ng
em
ra-
m.
and
lay
Thy

ory,
and
ll is
me

neral
ways

ances
hange
direct
Ware,

, ESSEX